620162

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/parliamentary-debates_july-27-august-12-1885_300

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

THIRD SERIES:

COMMENCING WITH THE ACCESSION OF

WILLIAM IV.

48° & 49° VICTORIÆ, 1884-5.

VOL. CCC.

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM

THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF JULY, 1885,

TO

THE TWELFTH DAY OF AUGUST, 1885.

EIGHTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1884-5.

LONDON:
PUBLISHED BY CORNELIUS BUCK,
AT THE OFFICE FOR "HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,"
22, PATERNOSTER ROW. [E.C.]

1885.

8995

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TO

VOLUME CCC.

THIRD SERIES.

LORDS, MONDAY, JULY 27.

Page

Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Bill—
Bill brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be *printed* (No. 207.)
Notice, The Earl of Milltown:—Short debate thereon 2

MALTA—EXAMINATIONS FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE (ARMY, NAVY, AND CIVIL)—Observations, Earl De La Warr, Viscount Enfield; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Dunraven) .. 4
PARLIAMENT—PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—HOUSE OF LORDS—THE FRESCOES IN THE PEERS' ROBING ROOM—Question, Observations, Lord Lamington; Reply, Lord Henniker:—Short debate thereon 13
DEFENCES OF THE EMPIRE—ARMAMENTS AND MUNITIONS OF WAR—Question, Observations, Lord Napier of Magdala; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for War (Viscount Bury:)—Short debate thereon .. 17

Waterworks Clauses Act (1847) Amendment Bill (No. 127)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª,"—(*The Viscount Enfield*) .. 24
After short debate, on Question? *agreed to*:—Bill read 3ª accordingly, and *passed*.

MEDICAL RELIEF DISQUALIFICATION REMOVAL BILL—Question, Observations, Earl Granville:—Short debate thereon 27
[7.45.]

COMMONS, MONDAY, JULY 27.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

—o—

Edinburgh Extension and Sewerage Bill [*Lords*] (*by Order*)—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 37
After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Bill be re-committed, in respect of Clause 36, to the former Committee,"—(*Sir Arthur Otway*;)—Question put, and *agreed to*.
Leave to the Committee to sit and proceed forthwith.

Southwark and Vauxhall Water Bill [*Lords*]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Sir Charles Forster*) 44
Second Reading *deferred* until *To-morrow*.

QUESTIONS.

LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND)—APPOINTMENTS OF MEDICAL OFFICERS—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 45
PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND)—INSANITARY CONDITION OF DUTHIL CHURCHYARD—Question, Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 46
POOR LAW (IRELAND)—MR. GRAHAM, CLERK TO THE BOARD OF GUARDIANS, COOTEHILL UNION—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 47
ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EXTRA POLICE AT GWEEDORE, CO. DONEGAL—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 47
ARMY—WIRE GUN CONSTRUCTION—Questions, Mr. Gray; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 48
FISHERIES (IRELAND)—THE RIVER SHANNON—THE LIMERICK BOARD OF CONSERVATORS—Questions, Colonel King-Harman, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 49
THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—PENSIONERS—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) .. 50
INDIA—MADRAS PRESIDENCY—REVOLT OF TALOOKS—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord Randolph Churchill) 51
LAW AND POLICE—THE "PALL MALL GAZETTE"—PUBLICATION OF OFFENSIVE ARTICLES—Question, Mr. P. A. Muntz; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 51
ARMY EDUCATION—THE STAFF COLLEGE—ORIENTAL LANGUAGES—Question, Colonel Milne-Home; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 52
FISHERY LAWS (IRELAND)—THE RIVER SUIR—CASE OF——O'SHEA AND OTHERS—Question, Mr. R. Power; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 53
LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE EARL OF BELFAST, CLERK OF THE PEACE, CO. ANTRIM—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 53
EGYPT—THE SOUDAN—THE SUAKIN-BERBER RAILWAY—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 54
ROADS AND BRIDGES (IRELAND)—THE TOUR SLATE QUARRIES—BRIDGE OVER THE RIVER SUIR—Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 55
ARMY—THE GUARDS—FATAL ACCIDENT AT CATERHAM RANGES—Question, Dr. Farquharson; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 55
POST OFFICE—PRE-PAYMENT OF POSTAGE—Question, Sir John Kennaway; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners).. .. 56
SOUTH AFRICA—BASUTOLAND—Questions, Sir Robert Fowler; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Colonel Stanley) 56
ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—APPOINTMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICERS—Question, Mr. T. D. Sullivan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 57
PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) BILL—Question, Mr. Findlater; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 57
INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND)—EXAMINATIONS — Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 58

Board of National Education (Ireland)—Extra Instruction—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 58

Parliamentary Elections—Registration of Voters Bill—Printing of the Voting Lists, Co. Armagh—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 59

Defences of the Empire—Defence of the Seaports—Questions, Captain Price, Sir John Hay; Answers, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) 59

Public Works—The Mail Jetty at Holyhead—Question, Mr. Morgan Lloyd; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland).. 60

Registry of Deeds Office, Dublin—Question, Colonel King-Harman; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) .. 60

Law and Justice (Ireland)—The Court of Bankruptcy, Dublin—Question, Mr. Findlater; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) 61

Turkey (European Provinces)—Affairs of Macedonia—Report of Major Trotter—Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) 62

Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry—Questions, Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 62

The Metropolitan Police—Question, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 62

Cyprus (Finance, &c.)—Landing Duties—Question, Viscount Newport; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Colonel Stanley) .. 63

Egypt (The Soudan)—The Garrison of Kassala—Questions, Sir Walter B. Barttelot, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) .. 64

Housing of the Working Classes—Sites of the Metropolitan Prisons—Questions, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Courtney; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 65

Egypt—Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 65

High Commissioner of New Guinea—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 66

Parliament—Public Business—Questions, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Mr. Lewis; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 66

Depression of Trade (Ireland)—A Royal Commission—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 66

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

——o——

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—Army Estimates—

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £3,398,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Provisions, Forage, Fuel, Transport and other Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886" 67

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £3,038,000, be granted, &c.,"—(*Sir George Campbell*:)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed 83

After debate, Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) £801,500, Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 110

(3.) £2,227,800, Supply, Manufacture, and Repair of Warlike Stores.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 118

[*July* 27.] *Page*

SUPPLY—ARMY ESTIMATES—Committee—*continued.*

(4.) £843,800, Works, Buildings, &c., at Home and Abroad.
(5.) £128,500, Establishments for Military Education.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 149
(6.) £51,700, Miscellaneous Effective Services.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 154
(7.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £248,100, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Salaries and Miscellaneous Charges of the War Office, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886" 168
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £246,500, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Labouchere*:)—After short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 28, Noes 95; Majority 67.—(Div. List, No. 248.)
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
(8.) £18,500, Rewards for Distinguished Services.
(9.) £78,000, Half Pay.
(10.) £1,194,300, Retired Pay, &c.
(11.) £124,800, Widows' Pensions, &c.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 171
(12.) £18,500, Pensions for Wounds.
(13.) £33,100, Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals.
(14.) £1,330,000, Out-Pensions.
(15.) £190,700, Superannuation Allowances.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 174
(16.) £49,900, Retired Allowances, &c. to Officers of the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteer Forces.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 174

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.—CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

(17.) £39,093, to complete the sum for the Lord Advocate and Criminal Proceedings, Scotland.

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

(18.) £106,333, to complete the sum for the British Museum.
(19.) £14,498, to complete the sum for Universities, &c. in Scotland.
(20.) £1,700, to complete the sum for the National Gallery, &c. Scotland.

CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS.

(21.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £18,142, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Salaries and Incidental Expenses of Temporary Commissions and Committees, including Special Inquiries" 177
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £17,942, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Whitley*:)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
(22.) £3,868, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Expenses.

AFGHAN WAR.

(23.) £250,000, Grant in Aid.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

(24.) £857,733, to complete the sum for Customs.
(25.) £1,643,157, to complete the sum for Inland Revenue.
Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £4,254,659, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office Services, the Expenses of Post Office Savings Banks, and Government Annuities and Insurances, and the Collection of the Post Office Revenue" 180
After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*
(26.) £553,781, to complete the sum for the Post Office Packet Service.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 181
(27.) £1,259,816, to complete the sum for the Post Office Telegraphs.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 183

CIVIL SERVICE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

CLASS I. — PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(28.) £5,000, Supplementary, Marlborough House.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 184
(29.) £16,050, Peterhead Harbour.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* .. 185
(30.) £16,000, Supplementary, Disturnpiked and Main Roads, England and Wales.
(31.) £6,800, Supplementary, Diplomatic and Consular Buildings.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES—Committee—*continued.*

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

(32.) £2,500, Supplementary, Revising Barristers, England.
(33.) £5,700, Supplementary, Prisons, Scotland.

CLASS V.—FOREIGN AND COLONIAL SERVICES.

(34.) £10,920, Supplementary, Colonies, Grants in Aid.

CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS.

(35.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £350, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the repayment to the Civil Contingencies Fund of certain Miscellaneous Advances" .. 190
After short debate, Motion made, and Question put, "That a sum, not exceeding £310, be granted, &c.,"—(*Mr. Labouchere*:)—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 23, Noes 60; Majority 37.—(Div. List, No. 249.)
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*
(36.) £40,000, Registration of Voters, England.
(37.) £6,600, Registration of Voters, Scotland.
Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

Customs and Inland Revenue (No. 2) Bill [Bill 223]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 192
After short debate, Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) Bill [Bill 99]—
Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 14th July*] 196
After some time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Wednesday*, and to be *printed* [Bill 251.]

Evidence by Commission Bill [Bill 238]—
Order for Committee read 207
After short debate, Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported*, without Amendment; read the third time, and *passed.*

Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill [Bill 244]—
Order for Second Reading read 208
After short debate, Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 250]—
Order for Second Reading read 208
After short debate, Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

Patent Law Amendment Bill [Bill 240]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 210
After short time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

Prevention of Crimes Amendment Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 93]—
Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Tomlinson*) 210
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Hopwood*:)—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to:*—Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1883-4.

Committee to consider the Savings and Deficiencies upon the Grants for Navy and Army Services in the year ended on the 31st day of March 1884, and the temporary sanction obtained from the Treasury by the Navy and Army Departments to Expenditure not provided for in the Grants for that year, *To-morrow.*
Ordered, That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments, which were presented upon the 23rd day of February last, be referred to the Committee.

[*July* 28.] Page

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Committee—*continued.*

which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, in aid of the Expense of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland" .. 306

After long debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 87, Noes 29; Majority 58.—(Div. List, No. 254.)

(2.) £108,441, to complete the sum for Prisons, Ireland.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 360

Moved, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Colonel Nolan:*)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow;* Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

SUPPLY—REPORT—Resolutions [27th July] *reported* 380

Resolutions 1 to 29, inclusive, *agreed to.*

(30.) £16,000 (Supplementary) (in Aid of the Cost of Maintenance of Disturnpiked and Main Roads in England and Wales.)

After short debate, Resolution *agreed to.*

Remainimg Resolutions *agreed to.*

County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (Pensions) Bill [Bill 112]

Order for Committee read 382

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Sexton:*)—Question put, and *agreed to:*—Committee *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

Lunacy Laws Amendment Bill [Bill 244]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 382

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported,* without Amendment; Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND [SALARIES]—

Considered in Committee 383

Resolution *agreed to;* to be reported *To-morrow.*

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS, &C. [ADVANCES]—

Considered in Committee 383

Resolution *agreed to;* to be reported *To-morrow.*

POOR LAW GUARDIANS, IRELAND [COST OF PROSECUTIONS]—

Considered in Committee 383

Resolutions *agreed to;* to be reported *To-morrow.* [2.0.]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, JULY 29.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Rathmines and Rathgar Township Bill [*Lords*] (*by Order*)—

Lords Amendment to Commons Amendments *considered* 385

After short debate, *agreed to.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—

(In the Committee.)

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed, "That a sum, not exceeding £466,303, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland" 385

[*July* 29.] Page

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—Committee—*continued.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the item of £37,150 be omitted from the proposed Vote,"—(*Mr. Sexton*:)—After short debate, Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*
Original Question again proposed 402
After debate, Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Item of £37,150, for Books and School Apparatus, be omitted from the proposed Vote,"—(*Mr. Sexton*:)—After further short debate, Question put:—The Committee *divided;* Ayes 26, Noes 126; Majority 100.—(Div. List, No. 255.)
Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

CLASS V.—FOREIGN AND COLONIAL SERVICES.

(2.) £24,690, to complete the sum for South Africa and St. Helena.—After debate, Vote *agreed to* 455

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

(3.) £4,254,659, to complete the sum for the Post Office.

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS.

(4.) £500, Supplementary, Gordon Monument.—After short debate, Vote *agreed to* 468
Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1883-4—
Considered in Committee 468
Resolutions *agreed to;* to be reported *To-morrow.*

WAYS AND MEANS.
Considered in Committee 473
Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, the sum of £45,361,227 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.
Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND [SALARIES]—
Order for Report thereupon read 473
Resolution *re-committed; considered* in Committee:—Resolution *agreed to;* to be reported *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

Public Works Loans Bill—Resolutions [28th July] *reported,* and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* (*Sir Henry Holland, Mr. Dalrymple.*)
Instruction to the gentlemen appointed to bring in the Bill, That they do make provision therein for the appointment of Public Works Loans Commissioners.
Bill *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 254] 474

East India Army Pensions Deficiency Bill—*Ordered* (*Sir Henry Holland, Colonel Walrond*); *presented,* and read the first time [Bill 255] 475

ADJOURNMENT—
Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Sir Henry Holland*) .. 475
After short debate, it being Six of the clock the House stood adjourned till To-morrow.

LORDS, THURSDAY, JULY 30.

Smoke Nuisance Abatement (Metropolis) Bill (No. 50)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Lord Stratheden and Campbell*) 476
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª.

Copyhold Enfranchisement Bill (No. 185)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Lord Hobhouse*) .. 482
Amendment *moved*, to leave out ("now") and add at the end of the Motion ("this day three months,")—(*The Earl Stanhope.*)
After short debate, on Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion? their Lordships *divided ;* Contents 14, Not-Contents 46; Majority 32:—*Resolved* in the *negative* :—Bill to be read 2^a on *this day three months.*

Pluralities Bill (No. 213)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Lord Bishop of London*) .. 493
Motion *agreed to* :—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

Poor Law Unions' Officers (Ireland) Bill (No. 214)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Marquess of Waterford*) .. 494
Motion *agreed to* :—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

Earldom of Mar Restitution Bill (No. 107)—
Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee,"—(*The Earl of Selborne*) 494
After short debate, Motion *agreed to* :—House in Committee accordingly.
Amendments (proposed by the Select Committee) made; the Report thereof to be received *To-morrow ;* and Standing Order No. XXXV. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with.

Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Bill (No. 207)—
House in Committee (according to order) 498
After short debate, Bill *reported,* without Amendment; and to be read 3^a *To-morrow.*

SCIENCE AND ART—SITE OF THE NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY—Observations, Lord Lamington; Reply, Lord Henniker 501
[8.15.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, JULY 30.

QUESTIONS.

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—THE SCHOOLMASTER OF STRANAGOMIS NATIONAL SCHOOL, CO. TYRONE—Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 504
ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EXTRA POLICE AT PORTADOWN—Questions, Mr. Macartney; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 505
REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE ACT, 1884—THE PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE (SCOTLAND)—CROFTERS UNDER £10 RENTAL—Question, Mr. D. J. Jenkins; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 505
LAW AND POLICE (SCOTLAND)—ILLEGAL IMPOUNDING OF CHILDREN—Question, Mr. D. J. Jenkins; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 505
CORPORATE BODIES (METROPOLIS)—THE CITY FELLOWSHIP OF PORTERS—Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 506
RAILWAYS (INDIA)—INDIAN MIDLAND RAILWAY—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord Randolph Churchill) 507

[*July* 30.] Page

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EXTRA POLICE AND HUT AT LISDOONVARNA, CO. CLARE—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 508

BANK CHARTER ACT, 1845—THE IRISH BANKS—NOTE ISSUE—Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 508

THE NAVY LIST—WARRANT OFFICERS—Question, Captain Price; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) .. 509

TRAMWAYS AND PUBLIC COMPANIES (IRELAND) ACT, 1883—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 509

INLAND REVENUE—STAMPS—STAMP DISTRIBUTORS IN DUBLIN—Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) 510

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS—TAXATION OF LEGAL EXPENSES—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross); Question, Mr. Arthur Arnold [no reply] 510

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND)—COPYING CLERKS—Question, Mr. Findlater; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) .. 511

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (IRELAND)—THE COUNTY DOWN ELECTION—THE BALLOT ACT—Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Gray; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes), The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 512

THE INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE—AGE OF CANDIDATES—Question, Mr. Thorold Rogers; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord Randolph Churchill) 513

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY—Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 513

NAVY—H.M.S. "CRUISER"—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Ritchie) 514

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—THE BIRMINGHAM ASSIZES—SHERIFFS' EXPENSES—Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 514

NAVY—THE EVOLUTIONARY SQUADRON—TORPEDO CREWS—Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) 515

NAVY—DOCKYARD EXPENDITURE—Questions, Mr. Puleston, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 515

EGYPT (FINANCE)—THE INTERNATIONAL GUARANTEED LOAN OF £9,000,000—Questions, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 516

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—MR. EDLIN, Q.C.—Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 518

TRAMWAYS ORDER IN COUNCIL (IRELAND) BILL—Question, Colonel Colthurst; Answer, Mr. Biggar 519

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—GALWAY AND ARRAN ISLAND DISPENSARIES—Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 519

BOARD OF INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND)—EXAMINATION OF GIRLS—Question, Mr. James Stuart; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 520

FACTORY ACTS (EXTENSION TO SHOPS) BILL—Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answers, Mr. Hopwood, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 521

PUBLIC HEALTH—THE CHOLERA IN SPAIN—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 521

SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND BILL—Question, Mr. Buchanan; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) .. 522

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (ENGLAND) BILL—Question, Mr. Gray; Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour), The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 522

RAILWAYS (INDIA)—THE CANDAHAR AND QUETTA RAILWAY—Questions, Sir Henry Tyler, Mr. Buchanan; Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Lord Randolph Churchill) 523

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS—SWINE—CLEANSING AND DISINFECTION OF PREMISES—THE ORDERS IN COUNCIL—Question, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Chaplin) 523

EGYPT (FINANCE)—THE INTERNATIONAL GUARANTEED LOAN OF £9,000,000—Questions, Mr. Villiers-Stuart, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 245

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL—Question, Captain Price; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Observations, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 525

INDIA (FINANCE, &c.)—THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT—Question, Sir Robert Fowler; Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Lord Randolph Churchill), The Chancellor of the Exchequer 526

THE COASTGUARD (IRELAND)—THE DIVISIONAL OFFICER AT DUNDALK—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 526

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 527

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS—EYE ELECTION—Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Sir Henry James; Answers, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) 527

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

SUPPLY—REPORT—Resolutions [29th July] *reported*—

Resolution 1 (£466,303, Salaries and Expenses of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland) 527

After short debate, Resolution *agreed to.*

Resolution 2 (£24,690, South Africa and St. Helena) 531

After short debate, Resolution *agreed to.*

Resolution 3 (£4,254,659, Post Office) 545

After short debate, Resolution *agreed to.*

Resolution 4 (£500, Supplementary, Gordon Monument) 548

After short debate, Resolution *agreed to.*

Telegraph Acts Amendment Bill [Bill 121]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*) 554

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee:—After some time spent therein, Bill *reported*, without Amendment, to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

Criminal Law Amendment Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 159]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Secretary Sir R. Assheton Cross*) 578

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in view of the fact that there already exists much legislation of the kind, little known or resorted to, and that besides much of it is of a contradictory character partly for the regulation and partly for the repression of vice, it is expedient that further inquiry and more deliberation be given to the subject before proceeding with the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Hopwood,*)—instead thereof.

Page

Criminal Law Amendment Bill—continued.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.
Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee .. 590
After some time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*.

Universities (Scotland) Bill [Bill 115]—
Moved, "That the Second Reading of the Bill be deferred till Monday next" 630
After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Second Reading *deferred* till *Monday* next.

WAYS AND MEANS
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill
Resolution [July 29] *reported*, and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* (*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Holland*); *presented*, and read the first time .. 631

Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) Bill [Bill 99]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 631
Bill to be read the third time *To-morrow*. [3.0.]

LORDS, FRIDAY, JULY 31.

Prince Henry of Battenberg's Naturalization Bill [H.L.]—
Certificate read; petitioner took the Oath 632
The Queen's consent signified by the Lord Chancellor; Bill read 2ª (according to order) and *committed forthwith*: Then Standing Order No. XXXV. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with*: Bill *reported* with amendments; read 3ª, and *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

RECENT LEGISLATION—THE SOCIALISTIC TENDENCY—Observations, The Earl of Wemyss; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury:—Short debate thereon 632

PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES ACT, 1879—Observations, The Earl of Powis; Reply, The Lord Chancellor (Lord Halsbury) 656

CUSTOMS DEPARTMENT—COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS—Question, The Earl of Limerick; Answer, The Earl of Iddesleigh (First Lord of the Treasury) 658

Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Bill (No. 207)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª,"—(*The Earl of Milltown*) .. 659
Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 3ª, and *passed*.

Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill (No. 221)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª,"—(*The Earl Brownlow*) .. 659
Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next. [6.30.]

COMMONS, FRIDAY, JULY 31.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

—o—

Worcester Extension Bill (*by Order*)—
Lords Amendments *considered*, and *agreed to* 660

[*July* 31.] *Page*

QUESTIONS.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND) — CORK COUNTY POLICE—Questions, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 667
EGYPT (THE SOUDAN) — THE GARRISON OF KASSALA — Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) 667
EGYPT—THE ASSEMBLY OF NOTABLES—Questions, Sir George Campbell, Mr. M'Coan; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) 667
MOROCCO—SUPPRESSION OF JOURNALS — Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. M'Coan; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) 669
EGYPT (FINANCE) — THE LOAN OF £9,000,000 — THE INTERNATIONAL GUARANTEE—Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) .. 670
NAVY—DOCKYARD EXPENDITURE—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 671
ARMY—GUNNERY EXPERIMENTS WITH DYNAMITE—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 672
SCHOOL GRANTS—COURT OF BANKRUPTCY—NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE—THE VICAR OF ST. MARK'S, SOUTH SHIELDS — Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) 672
LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES) — THE JEFFRIES CASE — MR. EDLIN, ASSISTANT JUDGE—Questions, Mr. Picton, Mr. Callan; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 672
LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—THE CIRCUIT SYSTEM—Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 673
EGYPT—COLONEL DE COETLOGON—Question, Mr. Leamy; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) .. 674
POLICE ENFRANCHISEMENT EXTENSION BILL — Question, Mr. Coleridge Kennard; Answer, Mr. Bryce 674
ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—WIDOW OF MR. FREDERICK RANCE—Question, Mr. Boord; Answer, The Surveyor General of the Ordnance (Mr. Guy Dawnay) 675
H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE — GOVERNMENT PRINTING — Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) 676
INDIA (FINANCE, &c.) — THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT — Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord Randolph Churchill) 676
THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—THE SUB-COMMISSIONERS — Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 677
INDUSTRIES (IRELAND)—A ROYAL COMMISSION—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 677
SCIENCE AND ART—EXAMINATIONS IN DRAWING—FAILURES TO PASS — Question, Mr. Picton; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) 678
SEED SUPPLY (IRELAND) ACT—NON-PAYMENT OF THE SEED RATE — Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 679
HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (ENGLAND) BILL—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 679

TELEGRAPH ACTS AMENDMENT BILL—Questions, Mr. Alderman W. Lawrence, Mr. Puleston; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) 679

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 680

MOTIONS.

Prince Henry of Battenberg's Naturalization Bill [*Lords*]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the first time,"—(*Mr. Stuart-Wortley, Under Secretary of State for the Home Department*) .. 681

Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read the first time.

Moved, "That the Standing Orders relating to Naturalization Bills be suspended, and that the Bill be read the second time,"—(*Mr. Stuart-Wortley*:)—Motion *agreed to*:—Standing Orders suspended:—Bill read a second time, and *committed.*

Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair:"—After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported,* without Amendment; read the third time, and *passed.*

Earldom of Mar Restitution Bill [*Lords*]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the first time,"—(*The Attorney General, Sir Richard Webster*) 683

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read the first time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*The Attorney General*:)—After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* to a Select Committee.

Committee *nominated*:—List of the Committee 685

Moved, "That the name of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) be added,"—(*The Attorney General*:)—Motion *agreed to*; name *added.*

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.

Ordered, That the Committee have leave to sit and proceed upon *Monday* next.

Bill to be *printed.* [Bill 256.]

THE PAPAL SEE — DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATION WITH THE VATICAN — SIR GEORGE ERRINGTON—Questions, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) .. 685

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Criminal Law Amendment Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 159]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 30th July*] 686

After long time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

Telegraph Acts Amendment Bill [Bill 121]—

Order for Third Reading read, and *discharged* 809

Moved, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect of Clause 2,"—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*:)—After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported,* with an Amendment; as amended, *considered.*

Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*:)—Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed,*

East India (Army Pensions Deficiency) Bill [Bill 255]—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Sir Henry Holland*) 811
After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Monday* next.

East India (Army Pensions Deficiency) [Creation of Annuity]—
Considered in Committee 811
Resolution *agreed to*; to be reported upon *Monday* next.

[3.20.]

LORDS, MONDAY, AUGUST 3.

Scottish and Irish Peerages Bill (No. 10)—
Bill (by leave of the House) *withdrawn* 812

River Thames (No. 2) Bill (No. 218)—
Amendments *reported* (according to Order) 813
After short debate, Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow*.

Registration Appeals (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]—*Presented* (*The Earl Beauchamp*); read 1ª; to be *printed;* to be read 2ª *To-morrow;* and Standing Order No. XXXV. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with. (No. 226) 815

Private Bills—
Standing Orders Nos. 10., 22., 52., 57., 64., 85., 114., 115., 134., and 179., *considered* and *amended;* and to be *printed* as amended (No. 227.)

[6.0.]

COMMONS, MONDAY, AUGUST 3.

QUESTIONS.

Piers and Harbours (Ireland)—Kingstown Pier—Question, Mr. Maurice Brooks; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) 816
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—The Circuit Arrangements—Question, Mr. Warton; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) 817
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts — Pleuro-Pneumonia (Ireland) — Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 818
Registry of Deeds (Ireland) Act, 1883—Question, Mr. Findlater; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) .. 818
Army—The Royal Irish Fusiliers—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 819
Post Office Clerks—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) 819
Alkali, &c. Works Regulation Acts—Gas Works — Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 820
Army Medical Service—Question, Mr. Beresford; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 821
Post Office—Insurance of Parcels — Question, Sir Robert Fowler; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) .. 821
Law and Justice (Ireland)—The Court of Queen's Bench (Fines and Penalties Office)—Mr. O'Brien, M.P. — Questions, Mr. M'Coan; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke), Mr. Speaker 822
Royal Commission on Depression of Trade and Industry — Names of the Commissioners—Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Broadhurst; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 823

[*August* 3.] *Page*

EDUCATION (IRELAND)—IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS—ASSISTANT TEACHERS—Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 824
ARREARS OF RENT (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—CASE OF MR. TEMPLEMAN, AGENT TO MR. S. C. ARMSTRONG—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answers, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners), The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 825
LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—WATERFORD FREE FORCE—Question, Mr. P. J. Power; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 826
REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND)—REVISION SESSIONS — KILMACTHOMAS UNION—Question, Mr. P. J. Power; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 826
REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND)—SUPPLEMENTAL LISTS, ARMAGH CO.—Questions, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 827
COMMISSIONERS OF CUSTOMS—A REPORT—Question, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) .. 828
SLIGO HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS — CHARGES FOR MOORING—LOAN FOR IMPROVEMENTS—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) 829
RELIEF OF DISTRESS (IRELAND) ACT, 1880—LOANS—CO. DONEGAL — Questions, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) 830
POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—SUNDAY MAIL TO ACHILL ISLAND—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) .. 831
POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—SORTERS IN IRISH MAIL TRAINS—Questions, Mr. Harrington, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) 832
ARMY—ROYAL MILITARY ACADEMY, WOOLWICH—MEAL HOURS OF CADETS —Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 832
EGYPT (THE SOUDAN) — THE SUAKIN-BERBER RAILWAY — Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith); Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor [no reply] 833
EGYPT (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION)—THE TROOPS AT SUAKIN—Questions, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. R. Preston Bruce, Colonel King-Harman; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 834
TREATY OF BERLIN, ARTICLE LXI.—REFORMS IN ARMENIA—Questions, Mr. M'Coan, Mr. Bryce; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) 835
WAYS AND MEANS—INLAND REVENUE — GROCERS' LICENCES (IRELAND) — Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 836
POST OFFICE — MAILS TO THE WESTERN ISLANDS — Question, Lord Colin Campbell; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) .. 837
GENERAL GORDON—DESIGN FOR A STATUE—Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) .. 837
REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) ACT—CO. ANTRIM — Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke), The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 837
EGYPT (THE SOUDAN)—BATTLE OF ABU KLEA—Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 839
LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—MR. F. FALKINER, Q.C., RECORDER OF DUBLIN —Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 839
ARMY — LINE BATTALIONS ON FOREIGN SERVICE — THE ROYAL IRISH AND THE EAST SURREY—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 839
LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—RELEASE OF ——— BRIGGS, A CONVICT—Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 840

Egypt (Internal Administration) — Use of the Kourbash and Forced Labour—Question, Mr. Villiers Stuart; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) 840

Royal Commission on Loss of Life at Sea—The Evidence — Question, Mr. Atkinson; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 841

Education (Ireland) — The Model School, Kilkenny — Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 841

Registration of Voters (Ireland)—Lists of Voters — Derry — Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 842

Education Department—College of Aberystwith—Question, Mr. Morgan Lloyd; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) 842

Parliament—Business of the House — Questions, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. Newdegate; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 843

Irish Land Commission — The New Commissioners — Question, Colonel King-Harman; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 843

Law and Justice (England and Wales) — The Jeffries' Case — Mr. Edlin (Assistant Judge)—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer Sir William Harcourt 843

Post Office—Sixpenny Telegrams—Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) .. 845

Housing of the Working Classes (England) Bill — Questions, Mr. Courtney; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Observations, Mr. Broadhurst, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 846

Egypt (Finance)—The International Guaranteed Loan of £9,000,000—The Correspondence—Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Mr. Villiers Stuart; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) 846

Parliament—Business of the House — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—Questions, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 847

Parliament—Business of the House — Police Enfranchisement Bill—Question, Mr. Coleridge Kennard; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 848

Parliament — Business of the House — Labourers (Ireland) Bill — Questions, Mr. Gray, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 848

Parliament—Business of the House—Secretary for Scotland Bill—Question, Sir Lyon Playfair; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 849

East India (Revenue Accounts)—

Ordered, That the several Accounts and Papers which have been presented to the House in this Session of Parliament, relating to the Revenues of India, be referred to the consideration of a Committee of the whole House.

Resolved, That this House will, upon Thursday, resolve itself into the said Committee.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Criminal Law Amendment Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 159]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress* 31*st July*] 850

After long time spent therein, *Moved*, "That the Bill, as amended, be reported to the House:"—After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:— Bill *reported*, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered upon *Wednesday*, and to be *printed* [Bill 257.]

Secretary for Scotland Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 242]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 922

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in view of the Report of a Select Committee of last Session, recommending that there should be one responsible Minister of Education for Great Britain, it is not expedient, before this House has considered that Report, to proceed with the proposal of this Bill, that the charge of Scotch education should be removed from the Vice President of the Council, thus lessening his influence and responsibility, in order to transfer it to the Secretary for Scotland intended to be created by this Bill," — (*Sir Lyon Playfair*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee .. 979

After short time spent therein, Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow*.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Sir Henry Holland, Secretary to the Treasury*) .. 980

Motion *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported*, without Amendment; to be read the third time upon *Wednesday*.

Public Works Loans Bill [Bill 254]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Sir Henry Holland, Secretary to the Treasury*) .. 981

Motion *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee:—After short time spent therein, Bill *reported*, without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow*.

Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 250]—

Committee *deferred* till *To-morrow* 983

Short debate thereon.

Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill [Bill 68]—

Bill *considered* in Committee 983

After some time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow*.

Infants Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 157]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Bryce*) .. 1025

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Onslow*:)—Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 17, Noes 54; Majority 37.—(Div. List, No. 269.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow*. [5.5. A.M.]

LORDS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 4.

Telegraph Acts Amendment Bill (No. 230)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Lord Mount-Temple*) .. 1026

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow*.

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—DELIMITATION OF THE FRONTIER—Question, Observations, The Duke of Marlborough; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury 1028

EGYPT (THE SOUDAN)—THE FRIENDLY TRIBES—Question, The Earl of Wemyss; Answer, The Marquess of Salisbury 1031

[*August* 4.] Page

THE NEW PUBLIC OFFICES—DESIGNS FOR THE NEW WAR OFFICE AND ADMIRALTY—Question, The Earl of Wemyss; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (The Earl of Iddesleigh).. 1032
[5.0.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 4.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Sunderland Corporation Bill (*by Order*)—
Lords Amendments *considered* 1033
Lords Amendments amended, and *agreed to.*

Ramsden Estate Bill [*Lords*] (*by Order*)—
Order for Third Reading read.. 1034
Moved, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect to Clause 5,"—(*Mr. Arthur Arnold:*)—After short debate, *Ordered*, That the Bill be read the third time *To-morrow.*

QUESTIONS.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—LONDON BOARD SCHOOLS—ANNUAL COST PER SCHOLAR—Question, Lord Algernon Percy; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1037
POOR LAW (IRELAND)—LURGAN UNION—DR. JOHN SCOTT—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1037
LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—PETTY SESSIONS CLERK, MULLAGHROE PETTY SESSIONS DISTRICT, Co. SLIGO—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1037
ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—PROTECTION POST AT BUNDUFF, Co. LEITRIM – Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1038
THE IRISH ADMINISTRATION—MR. E. G. JENKINSON—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) .. 1038
LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND)—THE CLERK TO THE BANGOR TOWN COMMISSIONERS—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1039
MARRIAGE LAW—ATTENDANCE OF REGISTRARS—Question, Mr. Atkinson; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) 1039
EGYPT (THE SOUDAN)—THE LATE EXPEDITION UNDER HICKS PASHA—CASE OF THE LATE E. B. EVANS, INTERPRETER—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) 1040
ARMY—SMALL ARM AMMUNITION—THE BOXER CARTRIDGE—Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1041
POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—TAMPERING WITH LETTERS—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) .. 1041
ENDOWED SCHOOLS—THE CHARITY COMMISSIONERS—TONBRIDGE SCHOOL—Question, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1042
INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—THE KILKEE DRAINAGE—Question, The O'Gorman Mahon; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) 1043
PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS—USE OF NATIONAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ROOMS—Question, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1044

[*August* 4.]

Page

Allotments Extension Act, 1882—Lady Isabella Dodd's Charity, Ellesborough, Bucks—Question, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1044

Post Office (Contracts)—The American Mail Service—Question, Mr. Giles; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) .. 1045

Western Pacific—New Guinea—Form of Government for the English Portion—Questions, Viscount Lymington, Mr. Bryce; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Colonel Stanley) 1046

Tramway Companies (Metropolis)—Employes Hours of Labour—Question, Mr. Samuel Smith; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 1046

The Corrupt Practices Act—The Suffolk Conservative Association—Question, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) 1046

Public Works (Ireland)—Deductions from Road Contractors' Accounts—Mr. F. Morris, Secretary to Grand Jury, Co. Clare—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1047

Law and Police—Illegal Fishing in Kildare—Insanitary Houses at Kill—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1048

Royal Irish Constabulary—Promotion of Head Constables—Question, Mr. Beresford; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1048

Parks (Metropolis)—The Regent's Park—Re-Enclosure of Land—Question, Mr. Daniel Grant; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) 1049

Railways (England and Wales)—Terminal Charges—Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1049

Trade and Navigation Accounts—Importation of Cattle, &c. from Ireland—Questions, Mr. Duckham, Mr. Newdegate; Answers, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) .. 1050

Registration of Voters—Return of Occupiers (England and Wales)—Question, Mr. Woodall; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) 1051

Constitution of the Admiralty—A Finance Lord—Questions, Sir John Hay, Mr. Gray; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) 1051

Navy—Accountant General of the Navy—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton .. 1052

Education Department—Instruction of Deaf-Mute Children—Question, Mr. Woodall; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1053

Education Department—London School Board Expenditure—Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1054

Egypt (Military Expedition)—The Soudan—Battle of Abu Klea—Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1055

Registration of Voters (Ireland) Act—Publication of Lists of Voters in North Antrim—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1055

Chili and Peru—The Peruvian Bondholders—Questions, Mr. Williamson, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) 1056

Explosives Act—Appointment of Mr. James Martin, Inspector for Brawney and Athlone—Question, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross 1057

[*August* 4.] Page

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS—PLEURO-PNEUMONIA IN IRELAND—Questions, Mr. Albert Grey, Colonel Nolan, Mr. Duckham; Answers, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Chaplin) .. 1058

DOMINION OF CANADA—THE MILITARY OPERATIONS—Question, Mr. Albert Grey; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 1060

LOSS OF LIFE AT SEA—THE ROYAL COMMISSION—THE EVIDENCE—Question, Mr. Atkinson; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1060

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES) — HUNGERFORD BOARD OF GUARDIANS — APPOINTMENT OF MASTER AND MATRON FOR THE WORKHOUSE — Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1061

RETURNS OF GROUND RENT—HOLDERS AND OWNERS OF MINING ROYALTIES—Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1061

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE—REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY — Question, Mr. Ince; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) .. 1062

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — Questions, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. A. R. D. Elliot; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 1062

POOR LAW GUARDIANS (IRELAND) BILL—LORDS' AMENDMENTS — Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1063

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (ENGLAND) BILL—Questions, Mr. Gray, Mr. Broadhurst; Answers. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross 1063

EGYPT (THE SOUDAN)—REPORTED DEATH OF OSMAN DIGNA—Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1064

EGYPT (THE MILITARY EXPEDITION TO THE SOUDAN) — LORD WOLSELEY'S REPORT—Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1064

PUBLIC HEALTH (METROPOLIS)—CONTAMINATION OF THE RIVER LEA—Question, Mr. John Holms; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1064

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Question, Mr. West; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1064

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 249]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*The Chief Secretary for Ireland*) 1065

After long debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Friday*.

Federal Council of Australasia Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 165]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved,* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Secretary Colonel Stanley*) 1119

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee 1122

After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow*.

Secretary for Scotland Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 242]—

Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 3rd August*] 1125

After long time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow*.

[*August* 4.] *Page*

Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 250]—
Bill *considered* in Committee [*Progress 29th July*] 1173
After some time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Thursday*, and to be *printed*. [Bill 258.]

Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill [Bill 68]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 1192
After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect of two New Clauses,"—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)
Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "two," and insert the word "four,"—(*Colonel King-Harman,*)—instead thereof.
Question, "That the word 'two' stand part of the Bill," put, and *negatived.*
The word "four" *inserted.*
Bill *re-committed* in respect of four New Clauses: *considered* in Committee.
After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, *considered.*
Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) [SALARIES]—
Considered in Committee 1194
Resolution *agreed to;* to be reported *To-morrow.* [2.30.]

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 5.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill (No. 229)—
House in Committee (according to order) 1195
Bill *reported*, without Amendment; and to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*
Observations, The Chairman of Committees (The Earl of Redesdale), Lord Denman [2.30.]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 5.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Ramsden Estate Bill [*Lords*] (*by Order*)—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Sir Charles Forster*) 1197
Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now read the third time," in order to add the words "re-committed in respect of Clause 5,"—(*Mr. Arthur Arnold,*)—instead thereof.
Question proposed, "That the words 'now read the third time' stand part of the Question:"—After short debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 48, Noes 25; Majority 23.—(Div. List, No. 272.)—Bill read the third time, and *passed*, without Amendment.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill—
Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time:"—

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—POLICY OF HER MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT—RESOLUTION—Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this Bill should not be proceeded with until the Government has explained to the House the policy of the Government with regard to Egypt, and the conditions under which the recent guaranteed loan was issued,"—(*Mr. Labouchere,*)—instead thereof 1200

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Question put, and *agreed to,* *Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill*—continued.

Main Question again proposed:—

THE PAPAL SEE—DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATION WITH THE VATICAN—SIR GEORGE ERRINGTON—Observations, Mr. O'Brien:—Short debate thereon 1228

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY—Observations, Mr. Arthur Arnold:—Short debate thereon 1236

Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read the third time, and *passed*.

Universities (Scotland) Bill [Bill 115]—

Moved, "That the Order for the Second Reading be read and discharged,"—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross*) 1250

Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *withdrawn*.

Police Enfranchisement Extension Bill [Bill 219]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 1251

Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Morgan Lloyd*:)—It being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow*. [5.50.]

LORDS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 6.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders Bill (No. 170)—

House in Committee (according to order) 1252

Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received *To-morrow*; and Standing Order No. XXXV. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with.

Poor Law Unions' Officers (Ireland) Bill (No. 214)—

Bill read 3^a (according to Order) 1260

On Motion, "That the Bill do pass?"—After short debate, Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons; and to be *printed*, as amended (No. 237.)

River Thames (No. 2) Bill (No. 171)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3^a,"—(*The Lord Mount-Temple*) .. 1260

After short debate, *Moved*, "That the Debate be adjourned till Monday next,"—(*The Lord Chancellor*:)—Motion *agreed to*:—Debate further adjourned to Monday next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended on Report (No. 238.)

Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill (No. 235)—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a,"—(*The Marquess of Waterford*) .. 1264

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read 2^a accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow*.

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill (No. 229)—

Bill read 3^a (according to Order) 1266

On Motion, "That the Bill do pass?"—After short debate, Bill *passed*. [6.30.]

COMMONS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 6.

QUESTIONS.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—A RURAL LETTER CARRIER, CO. CAVAN—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) 1266

[*August* 6.]

Page

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—THE "PENJDEH INCIDENT"—Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1267

EGYPT—THE SOUDAN—THE EXPEDITIONS TO SUAKIN—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 1267

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (ENGLAND)—THE BETHELL CHARITY TRUSTEES OF NEWARK AND MR. R. ROBINSON—Question, Mr. Warton; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1268

POST OFFICE—MAILS TO THE WESTERN ISLANDS—Question, Lord Colin Campbell; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) 1269

EGYPT—THE ALEXANDRIA INDEMNITY AWARDS — Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) 1269

NAVY—THE EVOLUTIONARY SQUADRON—Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) .. 1270

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND)—REVISION COURTS, CO. CAVAN—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1270

LUNATICS (IRELAND)—ARMAGH LUNATIC ASYLUM — Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) .. 1270

FISHERIES (IRELAND)—THE FOYLE AND THE BANN—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) .. 1271

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND)—PUBLICATION OF LISTS, CO. SLIGO—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1272

POST OFFICE—CONTRACTS—THE IRISH MAILS — Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) .. 1272

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) — REVISION COURTS, TYRONE AND DONEGAL—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1273

POST OFFICE — SUPERINTENDENTS OF SORTING OFFICES — Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) .. 1274

ARMY—THE 2ND EAST SURREY REGIMENT—Question, Mr. Francis Buxton; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 1275

EGYPT (THE SOUDAN)—SUPPLIES FOR THE TROOPS AT SUAKIN — Question, Colonel King-Harman; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1275

CHURCH OF ENGLAND—EXCOMMUNICATION AT SAHAM TONEY—Question, Mr. Picton; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 1276

POST OFFICE (SCOTLAND)—TELEGRAPH OFFICE CLERKS — Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) .. 1276

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—EXTRA POLICE, LIMERICK—Question, Mr. Lewis; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1277

ARMY—QUARTERMASTERS AND RIDING MASTERS — PROMOTION — Question, Mr. Causton; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1277

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE NORTHAMPTON VOLUNTEERS — Questions, Lord Burghley, Sir Arthur Hayter; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1278

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT) — WOOLWICH ARSENAL — Question, Mr. Boord; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Guy Dawnay) 1279

ENDOWED SCHOOLS—THE CHARITY COMMISSIONERS—SIR ANDREW JUDD'S SCHOOL, TONBRIDGE—Questions, Mr. Causton, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answers, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) .. 1279

PUBLIC HEALTH—THE RIVER THAMES—PURIFICATION OF SEWAGE—Question, Mr. Borlase; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1282

SOUTH AFRICA—THE BOERS—ATTACK ON MR. J. DONALDSON—Withdrawal of Question, Sir Frederick Milner 1282

[*August* 6.] Page

PUBLIC HEALTH — THE CHOLERA — Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour); Question, Mr. Brodrick [no reply] 1282

MEDICAL RELIEF DISQUALIFICATION REMOVAL BILL—THE SUPPLEMENTARY LISTS—Question, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1284

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) BILL—Questions, Mr. Brodrick, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1284

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY—Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1285

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. A. R. D. Elliot; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) .. 1285

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

INDIA—EAST INDIA (REVENUE ACCOUNTS)—THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT—

Considered in Committee 1286

Moved, "That it appears, by the Accounts laid before this House, that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1884 was £71,727,421, including £13,240,507 received from Productive Public Works; that the Total Expenditure in India and in England was £70,339,925, including £12,032,754 spent on Productive Public Works (Revenue Account); that there was an excess of Revenue over Expenditure in that year of £1,387,496; and that the Capital Expenditure on Productive Public Works in the same year was £3,992,029, including a Charge of £566,261 incurred in the redemption of previously existing liabilities," — (*Lord Randolph Churchill.*)

After long debate, Question put, and *agreed to*: — Resolution to be reported *To-morrow*.

Criminal Law Amendment Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 257]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 1386

After long debate, Further Proceeding on Consideration of Bill, as amended, *deferred* till *To-morrow*.

LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) [ADVANCES]—

Considered in Committee 1428

Resolution *agreed to*; to be reported *To-morrow*. [3.0.]

LORDS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 7.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders Bill (No. 170)—

Amendment *reported* (according to Order): Then Standing Order No. XXXV. *considered* (according to Order), and *dispensed with*; Bill read 3ª, with the Amendment 1429

On Motion, "That the Bill do pass?"—After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

TREATY OF BERLIN—ARTICLE X.—THE VARNA - RUSTCHUK RAILWAY—Question, Observations, Lord Sandhurst; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury 1434

Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill (No. 235)—

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee," — (*The Marquess of Waterford*) 1436

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—House in Committee accordingly.

Amendments made; the Report thereof to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended (No. 241.)

Public Health (Metropolis) Bill [H.L.] — *Presented* (*The Marquess of Salisbury*); read 1ª (No. 240) 1445

House adjourned during pleasure; and resumed by the Viscount Hawarden.

Criminal Law Amendment Bill [H.L]—

Returned from the Commons *agreed to*, with amendments; the said amendments to be *printed;* and to be considered on *Monday* next. (No. 242.)

[12.45.]

COMMONS, FRIDAY, AUGUST 7.

QUESTIONS.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT, 1876—VIVISECTION LICENCES—DR. E. E. KLEIN — Question, Mr. Firth; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 1446

PERU AND CHILI—THE PERUVIAN BONDHOLDERS—Questions, Mr. Williamson, Sir Henry Tyler; Answers, Mr. Speaker, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) 1446

TREATY OF BERLIN—ARTICLE X.—THE VARNA-RUSTCHUK RAILWAY COMPANY—Question, Mr. Tottenham; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) 1449

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE 4TH ROYAL IRISH FUSILIERS (CAVAN MILITIA)—MAJOR LIONEL BROOKE—Questions, Mr. Biggar, Colonel King-Harman; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1449

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—BELFAST UNION WORKHOUSE—CHARGE OF DRUNKENNESS AGAINST THE SCHOOLMASTERS—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1450

EDUCATION (IRELAND) — INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL AT BALLAGHADARREEN, CO. MAYO—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1451

LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) BILL—Questions, Mr. J. G. Hubbard, General Sir George Balfour; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1452

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY — MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—Question, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1453

LOTTERIES ACT—FOREIGN LOTTERIES—Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, The Solicitor General (Sir John Gorst) 1453

POOR LAW GUARDIANS (IRELAND) BILL—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1454

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) BILL—Questions, Mr. Brodrick, Colonel Nolan, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1454

AFRICA (EAST COAST)—GERMAN ANNEXATION AT ZANZIBAR—Question, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) 1455

INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—FLOODS IN CO. CLARE—Question, The O'Gorman Mahon; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) 1455

ARMY—RAILWAYS IN TIME OF WAR—Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1456

PUBLIC HEALTH (METROPOLIS)—STATE OF THE RIVER LEA—Question, Mr. Daniel Grant; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1456

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) ACT—THE ASSISTANT REVISING BARRISTERS—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1457

[*August* 7.] *Page*

Army — The Clothing Department — Military Temporary Clerks — Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Department (Mr. H. S. Northcote) 1457

Army—Limerick Army Clothing Factory—Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Surveyor General of the Ordnance (Mr. Guy Dawnay) .. 1458

The Parks (Metropolis)—Inclosure at Regent's Park—Question, Mr. Daniel Grant; Answer, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) 1458

Post Office—Registration of Telegraphic Addresses—Question, Colonel King-Harman; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) 1459

Representation of the People Act, 1884—Police Enfranchisement—Question, Mr. Coleridge Kennard; Answer, Mr. Speaker; Personal Explanation, Sir Henry James 1459

The Suez Canal—The Paris Conference—Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) .. 1460

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Criminal Law Amendment Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 241]—
Further Proceeding on Consideration, as amended, *resumed* .. 1461
After long debate, *Moved*, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross:*)—Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read the third time, and *passed*, with Amendments.

Housing of the Working Classes (England) Bill — Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1508

Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 258]—
Bill, as amended, *considered* 1509
After short debate, Bill read the third time, and *passed*, with Amendments.

County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (Pensions) Bill [Bill 112]—
Bill *considered* in Committee 1511
After short time spent therein, Bill *reported*, without Amendment.
Moved, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland:*)—Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *passed.*

Registration Appeals (Ireland) Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 259]—
Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported*, without Amendment; read the third time, and *passed* 1522

Land Purchase (Ireland) [Advances]—Resolution [6th August] *reported* 1522
After short debate, Resolution *agreed to.*

Police Enfranchisement Extension Bill [Bill 219]—
Adjourned Debate on going into Committee [5th August] .. 1523
Moved, "That the Debate be further adjourned till Monday next:"—After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Debate *further adjourned* till *Monday* next.

Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Bill [Bill 245]—
Moved, "That the Consideration of the Lords' Amendments be deferred till Friday the 21st of August,"—(*Mr. Sexton*) 1524
Motion *agreed to.* [1.45.]

LORDS, MONDAY, AUGUST 10.

Page

River Thames (No. 2) Bill (No. 238)—

Adjourned debate on the Motion for the third reading resumed (according to Order) 1525

Bill read 3ª—On Motion, "That the Bill do pass?"—After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

Army—Field Artillery and Small Arms—Question, Observations, The Earl of Wemyss; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Dunraven) 1525

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland—Question, Observations, The Earl of Milltown; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury .. 1528

Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry—Constitution of the Commission—Observations, The First Lord of the Treasury (The Earl of Iddesleigh):—Short debate thereon 1531

Memorandum for the Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry; ordered to be laid before the House,—(*The Earl of Iddesleigh.*)

Memorandum laid before the House (pursuant to Order of this day), and to be *printed* (No. 247.)

Army—The Army Reserve—End of Service with the Colours—Question, Observations, The Marquess of Lothian; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Dunraven) .. 1545

Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill (No. 235)—

Moved, "That the Report of the Amendments be now received,"—(*The Marquess of Waterford*) 1546

After short debate, on Question? their Lordships *divided*; Contents 43, Not-Contents 5; Majority 38.—*Resolved* in the *affirmative*.

After further short debate, Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow*; and to be *printed*, as amended (No. 245.)

Criminal Law Amendment Bill (No. 242)—

Moved, "That the Commons' Amendments be considered,"—(*The Earl Beauchamp*) 1549

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Commons' Amendments *considered*, and *agreed to*. [8.0.]

COMMONS, MONDAY, AUGUST 10.

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders Bill—

Lords' Amendments *considered* 1558

One *agreed to*; one *disagreed to*.

Committee *appointed*, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendment to which this House hath disagreed:"—List of the Committee .. 1564

QUESTIONS.

Central Asia—Russia and Afghanistan—The "Penjdeh Incident"—Arbitration—Notice of Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1564

Registration of Voters (Ireland)—The Clerk of the Peace, Sligo Co.—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1565

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

[*August* 10.] *Page*

Ceylon—Lighthouses—The Basses Lights, Minicoy Lighthouse—Question, Mr. Sutherland; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1565

Egypt—Light Dues—Questions, Mr. Sutherland; Answers, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1566

Law and Justice (Ireland)—The Bailiff to the Sheriff of Meath Co.—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1567

Parliamentary Voters—Registration of Voters in Agricultural Districts—Questions, Mr. Picton, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour), The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 1568

Law and Police—Political Clubs—Questions, Mr. M'Laren; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 1569

Slave Traffic — Anglo-Egyptian Convention of 1877—Question, Sir Robert Fowler; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) 1570

Commissioners of National Education (Ireland)—Erection of New Schools—Building Materials—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1570

Law and Police (Ireland)—Fines for Dangerous use of Fireworks at Ballinrobe—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1571

Public Meetings (Ireland)—The Meeting at Dromore, 1883—Death of —— Giffen—Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1571

Science and Art Department, Ireland—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1572

Mercantile Marine—Pilots—Test of Colour-Blindness—Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) 1572

Public Health (Metropolis)—Purification of the Thames—Question, Mr. Borlase; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1573

Endowed Schools—Alderman Dauntsey's Charity (West Lavington)—Questions, Mr. Acland, Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Chamberlain; Answers, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1573

Public Health (Metropolis)—Purification of the Thames (Canvey Island)—Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 1576

Africa (West Coast)—German Annexations — Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) 1576

Army—The Commissariat Staff—The Royal Marines—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Ritchie) .. 1577

Army—Alleged Unpopularity—Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 1577

Army—Military Farms at Aldershot—Question, Sir Arthur Hayter; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) .. 1577

The Irish Land Commission—The Appeal Court—Appeals from Tenants on Lord Rosse's Estate, Parsonstown—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) .. 1578

Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry—Constitution of the Commission—Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Observations, Mr. Shaw Lefevre .. 1579

Education of the Blind—The Royal Commission—Question, Sir Gabriel Goldney; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 1580

[*August* 10.] *Page*

THE REGISTRATION (SUPPLEMENTARY) LISTS—Questions, Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Clare Read; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross), The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1581

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—Questions, The Marquess of Hartington, General Sir George Balfour, Sir John Hay, Colonel Colthurst, Mr. James Stuart; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1582

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Housing of the Working Classes (England) Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 248]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross*) 1585

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That," to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it is inexpedient at this stage of the Session to initiate legislation involving the principle of a National subsidy towards aiding any locality in providing dwellings for the working class in such locality,"—(*Mr. Lyulph Stanley*,)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question:"—After debate, Question put, and *agreed to*.

Main Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow*.

Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 249]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*) 1621

After debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee .. 1637

After some time spent therein, Bill *reported*, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow*.

Moveable Dwellings Bill [Bill 239]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Digby*) .. 1705

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*:—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow*. [3.30.]

LORDS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 11.

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders Bill (No. 246)—

Commons' Reasons for disagreeing to one of the Amendments made by the Lords *considered* (according to Order) 1706

Moved, "That the House do not insist upon their Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed,"—(*The Marquess of Waterford.*)

Amendment *moved*,

To leave out all the words after ("That"), and insert ("this House, insisting on its Amendment, do now proceed to appoint a Committee to meet and confer with a Committee of the Commons"),—(*The Lord FitzGerald.*)

After short debate, on Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Motion?" their Lordships *divided*; Contents 21, Not-Contents 10; Majority 11.—*Resolved* in the *affirmative*.

The Amendment *not insisted* on, and a message sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith.

Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment Bill (No. 247)—

Commons' Amendments *considered* (according to Order) 1716

Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Commons in the said Amendments,"—(*The Lord Elphinstone.*)

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*.

Public Offices Site Act, 1882—Question, Observations, Lord Stratheden and Campbell; Reply, The First Lord of the Treasury (The Earl of Iddesleigh) 1716

Literature, Science, and Art—The National Gallery — Evening Opening—Question, Observations, The Marquess of Lothian; Reply, The First Lord of the Treasury (The Earl of Iddesleigh) .. 1718

Egypt—The Soudan Expeditions—Vote of Thanks to Her Majesty's Military and Naval Forces—Notice of Motion, The Marquess of Salisbury 1720

[5.45.]

COMMONS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 11.

QUESTIONS.

Poor Law (Ireland)—Lurgan Union—Dr. John Scott, Medical Officer—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1720

The Royal Irish Constabulary—Pursuit of Poachers—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir. W. Hart Dyke) 1721

Fishery Piers and Harbours (Ireland)—Greystones Harbour—Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) 1722

Commissioners of National Education (Ireland) — National School Teachers—Case of Mr. Andrew Devitt, Porrelsborough—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1722

Education Office (Ireland)—The Inspection Staff — Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Biggar; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1723

Poor Law (Ireland)—Mr. Wiggins, Master of the Clones Union Workhouse—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1724

Poor Law (Ireland)—Belfast Union Workhouse—Charge of Drunkenness against the Schoolmasters—Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1724

Law and Police (Ireland) — Detention of Intoxicated Persons—Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1725

Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry—Constitution of the Commission—Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Mr. Broadhurst; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer .. 1726

Royal Commission on Education of the Blind—Constitution of the Commission — Questions, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 1727

Administration of Oaths (Canada) — Questions, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Healy; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Colonel Stanley) 1727

Education Department—South Shields National Schools—Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1728

Street Traffic (Metropolis)—Obstruction in the Streets—Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 1728

Admiralty (Finance and Expenditure)—The Vote of Credit—Report of the Committee of Investigation—Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) .. 1729

Education Department—The London School Board — Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1729

[*August* 11.] *Page*

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) ACT—ASSISTANT REVISING BARRISTERS —Questions, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Healy; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1730

POST OFFICE—POSTAL DELAYS—Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) 1730

ARMY—THE ARMY RESERVE—Question, Mr. Harris; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) 1730

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (ENGLAND)—LIST OF VOTERS—WILLESDEN—Question, Mr. George Russell; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1731

NAVY—THE EVOLUTIONARY SQUADRON—Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) .. 1731

METROPOLIS—LOCAL GOVERNMENT OUTSIDE THE CITY AREA—Question, Mr. Firth; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 1732

ARMY—MILITARY EXPEDITION TO THE SOUDAN—WIDOWS OF SOLDIERS—Question, Mr. Giles; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Department (Mr. H. S. Northcote) 1733

NAVAL COURTS MARTIAL—COLLISION BETWEEN THE "HECLA" AND THE "CHEERFUL"—Question, Mr. Giles; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 1733

CIVIL SERVICE—LOWER DIVISION CLERKS AND WRITERS—Questions, Mr. Puleston, Mr. Tomlinson; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer 1733

CATTLE IMPORTATION—CANADIAN AND AMERICAN CATTLE—Questions, Mr. Duckham, Mr. Albert Grey, Mr. Brodrick, Mr. Staveley Hill, Colonel Nolan; Answers, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Chaplin) 1734

ALLOTMENTS EXTENSION ACT, 1882—FOLKESTONE CHARITY LAND—Questions, Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir Edward Watkin; Answers, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1737

METROPOLITAN WATER COMPANIES—Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 1738

LAW AND POLICE—ELIZA ARMSTRONG, A CHILD UNDER 14 YEARS OF AGE —Questions, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. Hopwood; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross).. 1739

RECREATION GROUNDS—WOODCOTE GREEN, BROMSGROVE—Questions, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 1739

THE CHARITY COMMISSIONERS' SCHEMES—LABOURERS' ALLOTMENTS—Question, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) 1740

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—AFFRAY IN CO. MONAGHAN—Questions, Mr. Healy; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1740

THE ELECTORAL ACTS—DISTRIBUTION—Question, Sir Henry James; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) 1741

MOTIONS.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE PROROGATION—MINISTERIAL STATEMENT—

Moved, "That the Standing Orders relating to Wednesday Sittings be suspended To-morrow,"—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) .. 1742

After short debate, Motion *agreed to*

PARLIAMENT—THE NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE (RULE 2)—ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE—THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY—CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMISSION—MOTION—

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn,"—(*Mr. Broadhurst*) .. 1745

Whereupon a number of Members—less than 40—rising in their places, the hon. Member could not proceed with his Motion.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Housing of the Working Classes (England) Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 248]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" 1745

After debate, Question put:—The House *divided;* Ayes 59, Noes 6; Majority 53.—(Div. List, No. 282.)

Bill *considered* in Committee 1760

After some time spent therein, Bill *reported*, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 249]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 1840

After debate, *Moved*, "That the Bill be now read the third time,"—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland:*)—Motion *agreed to.* (Queen's *consent* signified:)—Bill read the third time, and *passed*, with Amendments.

Educational Endowments (Ireland) Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 176]—

Moved, "That the Bill be now read a second time,"—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*) 1855

After short debate, Motion *agreed to:*—Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

Infants Bill [Bill 157]—

Moved, "That the Committee be deferred till Friday,"—(*Mr. Onslow*) .. 1856

Motion *agreed to.*

Prevention of Crimes Amendment Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 93]—

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th July], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (for Committee on the Prevention of Crimes Amendment Bill) [*Lords:*]—Question again proposed:—Debate *resumed*.. 1857

Question put, and *agreed to:*—Bill *considered* in Committee:—After short time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, *considered;* read the third time, and *passed*, with Amendments.

River Thames (No. 2) Bill [Bill 90]—

Lords' Amendments *considered* 1858

Lords Amendments amended, and *agreed to.* [3.48. A.M.]

LORDS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12.

EGYPT—SOUDAN EXPEDITION—VOTE OF THANKS TO HER MAJESTY'S MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES—RESOLUTIONS—

Moved to resolve,

"1. That the Thanks of this House be given to General Lord Wolseley, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., for the distinguished skill and ability with which he planned and conducted the Expedition of 1884-85 by the Nile to the Soudan" [and other Resolutions]—(*The Marquess of Salisbury*) 1859

After short debate, the said Resolutions severally *agreed to, nemine dissentiente.*

EGYPT—SOUDAN EXPEDITION—VOTE OF THANKS, &c.—*continued.*

Ordered, That the Lord Chancellor do communicate the said Resolutions to General Lord Wolseley, Admiral Lord John Hay, the Viceroy and Governor-General of India, and the Secretary of State for the Colonies, respectively, and that they be requested by the Lord Chancellor to communicate the same to the several Officers referred to therein.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY—CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMISSION—Personal Explanation, The First Lord of the Treasury (The Earl of Iddesleigh) 1868

House adjourned during pleasure, at 2.45 P.M.

House resumed at 7 P.M.

The Lord KINTORE—Chosen Speaker in the absence of the Lord Chancellor and the Lords Commissioners.

Several Bills returned from the Commons. [7.0.]

COMMONS, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12.

QUESTIONS.

VALUATION (METROPOLIS) ACT, 1869—APPEALS AGAINST ASSESSMENTS—Questions, Mr. Tomlinson; Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) 1870

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—SUPPRESSION OF DISORDERLY HOUSES—CASE OF MRS. JEFFRIES—Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Tomlinson 1870

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—THE NEW POST OFFICE AT MULLINGAR—Question, Mr. T. D. Sullivan; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) 1871

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—THE RIOT IN CO. MONAGHAN—Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1871

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—MR. HANS WHITE, J.P.—Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) 1871

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) ACT—ADDITIONAL REVISING BARRISTERS—Question, Mr. Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) 1872

MOTION.

EGYPT — SOUDAN EXPEDITION — VOTE OF THANKS TO HER MAJESTY'S MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES—RESOLUTIONS—

Moved, "That the Thanks of this House be given to General Lord Wolseley, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., for the distinguished skill and ability with which he planned and conducted the Expedition of 1884-5 by the Nile to the Soudan" [and other Resolutions]—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) 1872

After short debate, Resolutions *agreed to, Nemine Contradicente.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Housing of the Working Classes (England) Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 248]—

Bill, as amended, *considered* 1888

After short debate, Queen's *Consent* signified:—Bill read the third time, and *passed,* with the Amendments.

Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill [Bill 265]—

Lords' Amendments *considered* 1889

Several *disagreed to.*

Committee *appointed*, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to several of the Amendments made by the Lords to the said Bill:"—List of the Committee 1894

Reasons for disagreeing to the Lords Amendments *reported*, and *agreed to*:—To be communicated to the Lords.

Educational Endowments (Ireland) Bill [*Lords*] [Bill 176]—

Order for Committee read:—*Moved*, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair,"—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*) 1894

After short debate, Question put, and *agreed to*:—Bill *considered* in Committee:—After some time spent therein, Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

EDUCATIONAL ENDOWMENTS (IRELAND) [SALARIES AND EXPENSES]—

Considered in Committee 1913

Resolution *agreed to;* to be reported *To-morrow.*

Poor Law Unions' Officers (Ireland) Bill [Bill 262]—

Lords' Amendment *considered* 1913

After short debate, Lords' Amendment *amended*, and *agreed to.*

ADJOURNMENT—ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY — CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMISSION — Observations, Mr. Broadhurst .. .. [House counted out] .. 191

[7.5.]

LORDS.

NEW PEERS.

Monday, July 27.

Alexander William George Earl Fife in that part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland called Ireland, K.T., created Earl of Fife.

The Right Honourable Sir William Baliol Brett, Knight, Master of the Rolls, created Baron Esher of Esher in the county of Surrey.

Tuesday, July 28.

Sir Robert James Loyd-Lindsay, K.C.B., V.C., created Baron Wantage of Lockinge in the county of Berks.

TOOK THE OATH FOR THE FIRST TIME.

Thursday, July 30.

The Lord Bishop of Truro.

SAT FIRST.

Friday, July 31.

The Lord Kenyon, after the death of his grandfather.

THE MINISTRY

Of the Right Honourable WILLIAM EWART GLADSTONE,

As it stood at their Resignation of Office in June, 1885.

THE CABINET.

First Lord of the Treasury (Prime Minister)	Right Hon. William Ewart Gladstone.
Lord Chancellor	Right Hon. Earl of Selborne.
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland	Right Hon. Earl Spencer, K.G.
Lord President of the Council	Right Hon. Lord Carlingford.
Lord Privy Seal and First Commissioner of Works and Public Buildings	Right Hon. Earl of Rosebery.
Chancellor of the Exchequer	Right Hon. H. C. E. Childers.
Secretary of State, Home Department	Right Hon. Sir William V. Harcourt.
Secretary of State, Foreign Department	Right Hon. Earl Granville, K.G.
Secretary of State for the Colonies	Right Hon. Earl of Derby.
Secretary of State for War	Right Hon. Marquess of Hartington.
Secretary of State for India	Right Hon. Earl of Kimberley.
First Lord of the Admiralty	Right Hon. Earl of Northbrook.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Vice President of the Committee of Council for Agriculture	Right Hon. George Otto Trevelyan.
President of the Board of Trade	Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain.
President of the Local Government Board	Right Hon. Sir Charles W. Dilke. Bt.
Postmaster General	Right Hon. George John Shaw Lefevre.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Field Marshal Commanding in Chief	H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.
Vice President of the Committee of Council for Education	Right Hon. A. J. Mundella.
Lords of the Treasury	C. C. Cotes, Esq. Herbert Gladstone, Esq. R. W. Duff, Esq.
Lords of the Admiralty	Admiral Sir Astley Cooper Key, Admiral Lord Alcester, Rear Admiral Thomas Brandreth, Vice Admiral Sir William Hewett, William Sproston Caine, Esq., & George W. Rendel, Esq.
Joint Secretaries to the Treasury	Right Hon. Lord Richard Grosvenor. John Tomlinson Hibbert, Esq.
Secretary to the Admiralty	Sir Thomas Brassey.
Secretary to the Board of Trade	John Holms, Esq.
Secretary to the Local Government Board	George William Erskine Russell, Esq.
Under Secretary, Home Department	Henry Hartley Fowler, Esq.
Under Secretary, Foreign Department	Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice.
Under Secretary for Colonies	Hon. A. Evelyn Ashley.
Under Secretary for War	Earl of Morley.
Under Secretary for India	J. Kynaston Cross, Esq.
Paymaster General	Right Hon. Lord Wolverton.
Surveyor General of Ordnance	Hon. Henry Robert Brand.
Financial Secretary to the War Department	Colonel Sir Arthur Divett Hayter, Bart.
Judge Advocate General	Right Hon. George Osborne Morgan.
Attorney General	Right Hon. Sir Henry James.
Solicitor General	Sir Farrer Herschell.

SCOTLAND.

Lord Advocate	Right Hon. John Blair Balfour.
Solicitor General	Alexander Asher, Esq.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant	Right Hon. Earl Spencer, K.G.
Lord Chancellor	Right Hon. John Naish.
Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant	Right Hon. Henry Campbell-Bannerman.
Attorney General	Samuel Walker, Esq.
Solicitor General	The Macdermott.

QUEEN'S HOUSEHOLD.

Lord Steward	Right Hon Earl Sydney.
Lord Chamberlain	Right Hon. Earl of Kenmare.
Master of the Horse	His Grace the Duke of Westminster, K.G.
Treasurer of the Household	Right Hon. Earl of Breadalbane.
Comptroller of the Household	Right Hon. Lord Kensington.
Vice Chamberlain of the Household	Right Hon. Lord Charles Bruce.
Captain of the Corps of Gentlemen at Arms	Right Hon. Lord Carrington.
Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard	Right Hon. Lord Monson.
Master of the Buckhounds	Right Hon. Earl of Cork and Orrery.
Chief Equerry and Clerk Marshal	Lord Alfred H. Paget.
Mistress of the Robes	Her Grace the Duchess of Roxburghe.

THE MINISTRY

Of the Most Noble the Marquess of SALISBURY, K.G.,
As Formed on Acceptance of Office June-July, 1885.

THE CABINET.

Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Prime Minister)	The Most Noble The Marquess of Salisbury, K.G.
Lord Chancellor of England . . .	Right Hon. Lord Halsbury.
Lord Chancellor of Ireland . . .	Right Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
Lord Lieutenant of Ireland . . .	Right Hon. Earl of Carnarvon.
Lord President of the Council . . .	Right Hon. Viscount Cranbrook.
Lord Privy Seal	Right Hon. Earl of Harrowby.
First Lord of the Treasury . . .	Right Hon. Earl of Iddesleigh, G.C.B.
Chancellor of the Exchequer . . .	Right Hon. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Bart.
Secretary of State, Home Department .	Right Hon. Sir Richard Assheton Cross, G.C.B.
Secretary of State for the Colonies .	Right Hon. Frederick Arthur Stanley.
Secretary of State for War . . .	Right Hon. William Henry Smith.
Secretary of State for India . . .	Right Hon. Lord Randolph Churchill.
First Lord of the Admiralty . . .	Right Hon. Lord George Hamilton.
President of the Board of Trade . .	His Grace the Duke of Richmond and Gordon, K.G.
Postmaster General	Right Hon. Lord John Manners, G.C.B.
Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education	Right Hon. Edward Stanhope.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Field Marshal Commanding in Chief .	H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge, K.G.
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Vice President of the Committee of Council on Agriculture . . .	Right Hon. Henry Chaplin.
President of the Local Government Board	Right Hon. Arthur James Balfour.
First Commissioner of Works and Public Buildings	Right Hon. David Robert Plunket.
Lords of the Treasury	Charles Dalrymple, Esq. Hon. Sidney Herbert. Colonel Walrond.
Lords of the Admiralty	Vice Admiral Hood, Vice Admiral Sir Anthony Hoskins, Vice Admiral Brandreth, Captain Codrington, Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett, Esq.
Joint Secretaries to the Treasury . .	Aretas Akers-Douglas, Esq. Sir Henry Holland, Bart.
Secretary to the Admiralty . . .	Charles Thompson Ritchie, Esq.
Secretary to the Board of Trade . .	Baron Henry de Worms.
Secretary to the Local Government Board	Right Hon. Earl Brownlow.
Under Secretary, Home Department .	Charles Beilby Stuart-Wortley, Esq.
Under Secretary, Foreign Department .	Right Hon. Robert Bourke.
Under Secretary for Colonies . . .	Right Hon. Earl of Dunraven.
Under Secretary for War	Right Hon. Viscount Bury.
Under Secretary for India . . .	Right Hon. Lord Harris.
Paymaster General	Right Hon. Earl Beauchamp.
Surveyor General of Ordnance . .	Hon. Guy Cuthbert Dawnay.
Financial Secretary to the War Department	Hon. H. S. Northcote.
Judge Advocate General	Right Hon. William Thackeray Marriott, Q.C.
Attorney General	Sir Richard E. Webster, Q.C.
Solicitor General	John Eldon Gorst, Esq., Q.C.

SCOTLAND.

Lord Advocate	John Hay Athol Macdonald, Q.C.
Solicitor General	J. P. Bannerman-Robertson, Esq.

IRELAND.

Lord Lieutenant	Right Hon. Earl of Carnarvon.
Lord Chancellor	Right Hon. Lord Ashbourne.
Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant .	Right Hon. Sir William Hart Dyke.
Attorney General	Right Hon. Hugh Holmes, Q.C.
Solicitor General	John Monroe, Esq., Q.C.

QUEEN'S HOUSEHOLD.

Lord Steward	Right Hon. Earl of Mount-Edgcumbe.
Lord Chamberlain	Right Hon. Earl of Lathom.
Master of the Horse	Right Hon. Earl of Bradford.
Treasurer of the Household . . .	Right Hon. Viscount Folkestone.
Comptroller of the Household . .	Right Hon. Lord Arthur Hill.
Vice Chamberlain of the Household . .	Right Hon. Viscount Lewisham.
Captain of the Corps of Gentlemen at Arms	Right Hon. Earl of Coventry.
Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard .	Right Hon. Viscount Barrington.
Master of the Buckhounds . . .	Most Noble the Marquess of Waterford.
Chief Equerry and Clerk Marshal . .	Lord Alfred H. Paget.
Mistress of the Robes	Her Grace the Duchess of Buccleuch.

HANSARD'S

PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES,

IN THE

SIXTH SESSION OF THE *TWENTY-SECOND PARLIAMENT* OF THE
UNITED KINGDOM OF *GREAT BRITAIN* AND *IRELAND*,
APPOINTED TO MEET 29 APRIL, 1880, IN THE FORTY-THIRD
YEAR OF THE REIGN OF

HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA.

EIGHTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1884-5.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 27*th July*, 1885.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE—*Fifth Report*—Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod. [No. 210].

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Medical Relief Disqualification Removal (207); Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) * (209).

Committee — Public Health (Members and Officers) * (194).

Committee — Report — Shannon Navigation * (184); Polehampton Estates* (183); National Debt *; School Boards * (200); Exchequer and Treasury Bills *; Greenwich Hospital * (201).

Report—Post Office Sites * (181); River Thames (No. 2) * (171).

Third Reading—Waterworks Clauses Act (1847) Amendment (127); Turnpike Acts Continuance * (174); Public Health (Ships, &c.) * (186); Artillery and Rifle Ranges * (193); Submarine Telegraph Cables * (203), and *passed*.

NEW PEERS.

Alexander William George Earl Fife in that part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland called Ireland, K.T., having been created Earl of Fife—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

The Right Honourable Sir William Baliol Brett, Knight, Master of the Rolls, having been created Baron Esher of Esher in the county of Surrey—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

MEDICAL RELIEF DISQUALIFICATION REMOVAL BILL.

Bill brought from the Commons; read 1ª; to be *printed*. (No. 207.)

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN: I beg leave to give Notice that I propose on Thursday next to move the second reading of this Bill.

EARL GRANVILLE: I do not know, in the absence of the noble Marquess the Leader of the House, by what right the noble Earl takes upon himself to move the second reading of this Bill on Thursday. It is a most unusual course. I myself intended to move the second reading to-morrow, as it is a matter of great urgency.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN: I shall be most happy to meet the suggestion of the noble Earl, and put the Bill down for to-morrow.

EARL GRANVILLE: I do not quite know why the noble Earl has taken up this measure.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN: I suppose I have as great a right to do so as any other Peer.

EARL GRANVILLE: I have been asked to take charge of this Bill; but the noble Earl, of his own Motion, takes charge of it. The Government, as stated by their Leader in "another place," do not wish to delay the Bill; and yet the noble Earl has taken upon himself, without any request from any other person, to move the second reading on Thursday. That is the most unusual course that I have ever seen taken since I have been in the House of Lords. I give Notice that, unless we hear something as to the intentions of the Government, I propose to take the second reading of the Bill to-morrow.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN: I object to this action of the noble Earl as entirely out of Order, and inconsistent with the Standing Orders of the House. I gave Notice, as I had a perfect right to do, to the Clerk of the Parliaments, that I would take charge of the Bill when it came up from the other House, as I have always felt very strongly on the subject. It was not in charge of anyone in the other House when it was passed, and Sir William Harcourt stated that it was in charge of the House itself. The noble Earl is absolutely in error; for the Bill is a derelict, and came to this House without a Leader, and it was therefore open to anyone to take it up here. I accordingly came down to the House to take charge of the Bill, and I cannot understand on what grounds the noble Earl objects to my action.

EARL GRANVILLE: The first reading of a Bill is usually considered a formal stage in this House, and in this case was taken as a matter of course. Not being able to walk very quickly at present, I was two or three minutes late in reaching the House, and therefore did not hear it; but I had intended, in accordance with an arrangement I had made with those interested in the Bill in the other House, to intimate that I would give Notice of the second reading for to-morrow.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN: My Notice having been given first will remain first on the Paper, according to the Standing Orders.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: The noble Earl has given Notice that he will move the second reading on Thursday. By that time, no doubt, he will find that the Bill has been read a second time and passed on the Motion of my noble Friend. We have no objection.

LORD ELLENBOROUGH: I rise to Order. I beg to point out that this discussion is irregular, and I object to its being continued. I have been called to Order for much less.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY: I must call attention to the facts of the case. If this Bill is a derelict, it is because it was abandoned by the Leader of the House of Commons. There can be no question as to who ought to have charge of the Bill in this House, for it was at once taken charge of by the Liberal Leader for the time being—Sir William Harcourt. [*Cries of* "No!"] It was at all events passed on his Motion, and he handed it over to my noble Friend near me. There is no question as to whose Bill it is.

EARL GRANVILLE: We entirely agree as to the advisability of passing the Bill, and it is very undesirable that we should keep up this quarrel about it. I think, however, I have some little title, by my position in the House and following the usual practice, to say that I will take charge of the Bill.

MALTA — EXAMINATIONS FOR THE PUBLIC SERVICE (ARMY, NAVY, AND CIVIL).—OBSERVATIONS.

EARL DE LA WARR, in rising to call attention to the subject of centres of examination for the Public Service (Army, Navy, and Civil), specially with reference to Malta, said, that, in bringing this question under their Lordships' notice, he felt he ought to offer some apology when there were noble Lords who, from the Office which they had held as Secretary of State for the Colonies, must be better informed than he could be with regard to the circumstances and the wants of Malta. At the same time, from his own personal knowledge, he was not without confidence that the subject, being one of such great importance to the interests of the Maltese people, would meet with favourable consideration from their Lordships. On a former occasion, when he called the attention of the House to the subject, he was not in a position to be able to refer to official Papers. Those Papers had since been laid on the Table; and he now hoped to show that the view which he had previously taken was supported by those who were best able to form an opinion. In the Notice which he had given, he had asked their Lordships' attention to the subject of examinations for the Public Service. He thought, however, it might not be necessary to enter now into any details upon the general question; but, assuming that their Lordships were aware of the importance of these examinations, as being now almost the only way of admission for a young man to enter into public life, and, therefore, how important it was that they should be open to, and within the reach of, all Her Majesty's subjects, he would confine himself to the question so far only as it related to Malta. It was in the year 1878 that a Member of the Council of Government in Malta—Mr. Savona —moved an Address to the Governor, which was seconded by the Chief Secretary, to the effect—

> "That Her Majesty's Government might be induced to permit such of Her Majesty's subjects Natives of the Maltese Islands as may wish to compete for the Army, Navy, or the Civil Service in England and India, to be examined in Malta under such regulations as the Civil Service Commissioners may deem it expedient to lay down."

It would be well, perhaps, to notice here an objection which was made last year in this House by the noble Earl the late Secretary of State for the Colonies (the Earl of Derby) with regard to making Malta a centre for these examinations. The noble Earl said—

> "Malta could not be treated differently to other Colonies; and if this question were raised, it would have to be raised on a larger scale, for peculiar favour could not be shown to Malta to the exclusion of other Colonies and Dependencies not much more distant, and with equal claims."

Now, with reference to this it should be remembered that the circumstances of different Colonies and Dependencies were widely dissimilar; their position, their means of trade and commerce, their native industries, their character and nationality, their climate—in many of these and other respects there was often little or no resemblance. Was it not, therefore, reasonable, before drawing a hard and fast line and treating all alike, to take each case upon its merits? What applied to Malta might not apply to Canada or Australia, or *vice versâ*. That view was taken by the Civil Service Commissioners in the Correspondence recently laid before the House. They said—

> "Any proposal to hold examinations in remote localities would have to be considered on its own merits."

But, besides this, Malta could not be considered as at all similar to other Colonies and Dependencies of the British Empire. Strictly speaking, it would be incorrect to describe it as a Colony, which, in the usual acceptation of the word, was an offshoot of the parent country. Malta was a country which voluntarily placed itself under the dominion of England, and thenceforward the Maltese people became entitled to all the rights and privileges of British subjects. It was said by Lord Cochrane in the House of Commons, in 1816, referring to the relations of Malta to this country, and as a Dependency of the British Crown—

> "The fortresses were reconquered from France by the Maltese, and not by this country."

He need hardly remind their Lordships that Malta was one of the most valuable Dependencies of England. Where would British influence in the Mediterranean be without Malta? With France at Toulon, and now also at Tunis, where one of the finest harbours in the world might with little difficulty be made, what in the event of war would be the position of this country without Malta? It was the interest of England to accord to the Maltese people not only the rights and privileges to which as British subjects they were entitled, but also such advantages as might tend to cultivate loyalty and attachment to the British Crown. Was it not a small thing which was asked for? A small thing to grant, but which would be a great boon to the receiver, a boon which would be highly valued, and which would open a door to the rising and talented youth of Malta to become useful subjects in the British Empire wherever British sway extends. It was said, why should not the youth of Malta come to this country to attend the examinations for admission to the Public Service? It must be remembered that Her Majesty's subjects in Malta were not in the same affluent circumstances as those in England, or some other Dependencies and Colonies, and that the salaries of those holding Government appointments bore no resemblance as regarded amount to those in this country and elsewhere. The salary of a Judge, or Councillor, or Head of a Department did not exceed £500 a-year, and other offices and appointments were in like proportion. Very few young men could provide the means of coming to England to attend the examinations, with the uncertainty also of success, owing to the high pressure of competition which now existed. On that point Sir Charles Straubenzee, when Governor of Malta, said, in one of his despatches to the Colonial Office—

> "The great boon, however, that such concessions would confer upon this community by the opening out of a new field of industry beyond the narrow limits of these islands, and also the very limited means of the parents and families of the young men (who may have distinguished themselves at the local schools and are desirous of embracing professions beyond those obtainable in Malta), which almost preclude the possibility of permitting them to do so owing to the expense of the voyage, their maintenance in England, &c., have together induced me to bring this subject under your most favourable consideration."

With reference also to the peculiar circumstances of Malta, Lord Glenelg, when Secretary for the Colonies, said—

> "It was peculiarly the duty of Great Britian to take care that the principles of British freedom, and the full benefit of British legislation, should be brought into operation in Malta even above all other Dependencies of the British Crown."

He (Earl De La Warr) regretted that in the government of Malta we had not fully acted upon the principles of British freedom and the full benefits of British legislation. It was quite possible to treat Malta as a fortress—a most important fortress—and, at the same time, to remember that there was a Native population, and a considerable one, who were entitled to the rights, the privileges, and the advantages of British subjects. Sir Patrick Keenan, Commissioner of National Education in Ireland, who in a Report made to Parliament in 1880 on the educational system in Malta, said—

> "It would be serving a great Imperial purpose, besides strengthening the service by the introduction of men of the diligence and intelligence of the Maltese, if they could arrange to make Malta a centre for all the examinations which are open to the public at home."

Their Lordships were aware that Italian was the language in Malta of the Law Courts, of the Church, and of commerce. There was, therefore, little inducement for men of education to study the English language. If, however, the public examinations were within their reach, it would be widely different. A field would be opened to talent and diligence, and the youth of Malta would, no doubt, soon be found in honourable competition with other British subjects for appointments in the Public Service. In a letter from the late Governor of Malta (Sir Arthur Borton), which he (Earl De La Warr) had permission to make use of, after strongly advocating this concession in despatches which were on the Table of the House, were these words—

> "I feel certain that, if it can be done, no measure will be more likely to strengthen the hands of my successor and increase the loyalty of the Maltese."

These words represented very much the views of the noble Earl (the Earl of Kimberley), who was Secretary of State for the Colonies in the year 1880. In a letter from the Colonial Office to the Civil Service Commission, who at that time expressed an unfavourable opinion, it was stated—

> "Lord Kimberley would, however, strongly urge that this decision should be reconsidered. He attaches considerable importance to this measure, both as a means of facilitating the efforts of the Colonial Government to promote the study of the English language in Malta, and of attaching the Maltese to this country by enabling them to enter Her Majesty's Service."

He (Earl De La Warr) would wish to make these words his own, in urging Her Majesty's Government to consider the claims of a people who, as British subjects, had never swerved from their loyalty to the British Crown. It must be remembered that the British Empire was a widespreading and far-reaching one, and it must also be borne in mind that there were British subjects in distant lands as much to be cared for, and who were as capable, if the opportunity were offered them, of serving their country, as those who were living in this great Metropolis.

VISCOUNT ENFIELD, as Chief Civil Service Commissioner, said, he wished to state what the action of the Commission had been in the important question to which the noble Earl opposite (Earl De La Warr) had called attention. In June, 1878, the Secretary of State for the Colonies sent to the Civil Service Commissioners a despatch from the Governor of Malta, as to the possibility of Natives of that place being admitted to compete for appointments in the Army, Navy, or Civil Service of England and India. The then Secretary of State looked favourably on the idea of making Malta a centre of examination, as the expense of a journey to England to attend such examinations almost acted as prohibitory to the young men in the island. But, on the 3rd of August, the Civil Service Commissioners replied that they considered the difficulties so great as to make the suggestion impracticable. The subject was re-opened in 1880, and on the 25th of October his noble Friend (the Earl of Kimberley), then Secretary of State for the Colonies, inclosed to the Civil Service Commissioners the copy of a despatch from Major General Fielding, acting Governor of Malta, requesting that the matter might be further considered, urging as additional reasons that the measure would be—

> "A means of facilitating the efforts of the Colonial Government to promote the study of the English language in Malta, and of attaching the Maltese to this country by enabling them to enter Her Majesty's Service."

On the 19th of November the Commissioners wrote to the Director General of Military Education to inquire whether his Royal Highness the Commander-in-Chief would have any objections to the candidates for the Army undergoing their preliminary examination at Malta, while they postponed the question as to whether the "further examination" could be held there. They were informed that His Royal Highness had no objection. On the 15th of December the Commissioners addressed the Treasury, stating that they were considering whether they could hold at Malta "preliminary examinations," and possibly from time to time a competitive examination for "Clerkships of the Lower Division." On the 28th of January, 1881, his noble Friend forwarded to the Commissioners an inclosure from the Governor of Malta, General Sir Arthur Borton, intimating that such a concession to the feelings and wishes of the inhabitants of Malta would materially facilitate the adoption of certain educational reforms in that island, which were shortly to be submitted to the Council. On February 23, 1881, the Treasury, in reply to the Commissioners, urged the objection that, if this concession were made to Malta, the Commissioners would in time be obliged to hold simultaneous examinations in every Dominion of the Crown, and declined to commit itself to such a principle without much further consideration. On March 11, in reply to the Treasury, the Commissioners said that they did not think the precedent would prove embarrassing, as they had declined to hold such examinations in India and in Australia; the distinction, in their view, lay in the remoteness of the country, and each case should be decided on its merits. The Commissioners also expressed their willingness to hold the following examinations in Malta:—(*a*) Preliminary examinations for Army; (*b*) Preliminary examinations for Class 1; (*c*) Examinations for registration as copyists; (*d*) Competitions for men clerks, Lower Division. On the 28th of March the Treasury, in their reply, offered no objection to the preliminary examinations being held in Malta, but again declined to sanction the examinations for temporary copyists and the Lower Division. This decision of the Treasury was communicated to the Colonial Office by the Civil Service Commissioners. On the 24th of May the Colonial Office sent to the Civil Service Commissioners a copy of a despatch from the Governor of Malta, urging a reconsideration of their decision, in which it was pointed out that the boon of holding preliminary examinations only in Malta would be but a very slight advantage, as the Maltese could hardly meet the great expenses of coming to this country for the open competition. Correspondence on the subject had since remained in abeyance. The Civil Service Commissioners in the meantime agreed to hold examinations for engineer students at Malta; but the arrangement had not been carried out. But during the last few years, examinations had been held on the island for entrance into the Fencible Artillery, and for certain appointments in the dockyards and military prisons. He could not help hoping, however, that in the course of time the difficulties might be smoothed away; and, so far as the Civil Service Commissioners were concerned, they would be glad to lend a helping hand to the Colonial Office in carrying out the laudable object of the noble Earl opposite. He entirely agreed that the subject was one of great interest; and if a concession could be made it would be of the very greatest importance.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of DUNRAVEN) said, that with the remarks of the noble Earl who had brought this matter forward (Earl De La Warr) he almost entirely agreed. The noble Earl had laid great stress upon the importance to us of Malta; but it was not necessary, or indeed possible, for him to say anything on that point, because he was sure that Her Majesty's Government, in considering the possibility of granting any privilege to any of the Colonies or Dependencies of this country, would judge of the matter solely on its merits, and not with any reference whatever to the relative importance of the Colonies to this country. He thought that the question was more difficult and more complicated than the noble Earl supposed. The noble Earl had very wisely confined his observations to the case of Malta; but it was impossible not to consider the question with reference to the case of other Colonies and Dependencies also; and, as regarded the more distant Colonies, difficulties existed which, he must say, appeared to him to be insuperable. He did not see how *vivâ voce* examinations could be carried on in different centres of examination without danger of gross injustice. In the case of examinations conducted on paper, it was, of course, different; but, in that respect also, difficulties arose which seemed to him to be almost insuperable with regard to their more distant Colonies, because it was obvious that a delay of many days, and even weeks, in receiving the examination papers at home would be attended with great inconvenience, hardship to candidates, and possible injustice. But these objections did not apply to the same extent to the Dependency with which the noble Earl had chiefly dealt—namely, Malta. As far as the *vivâ voce* examination went, the objection, of course, applied equally to both cases; but as regarded the examination conducted entirely on paper, the objection did not apply to the same extent in the case of Malta, which lay at a distance of four or five days from London. For himself, he might say that he believed that very sound arguments could be adduced in favour of making a difference between Malta and other Colonies. He did not think, however, that he need go into that question now. There was a difference between great self-governing Colonies and a small Dependency such as Malta. There was no outlet at all in Malta for the energies of the people. They were very poor as a rule, and could not afford the expense of coming to this country. There was a very large population, and a very small area upon which they could be supported. It was quite obvious, and it was most important, therefore, that they should have a fair opportunity of obtaining employment in the Civil Service, as well as in the Army and Navy. He saw a great deal of weight in the arguments which the noble Earl had brought forward, and, personally, he hoped that the difficulties which stood in the way might be got over. The question was one which had been before the Colonial Office on a great many occasions. It had always been pressed forward by that Department, and he could certainly undertake to say that the Office which he had the honour to represent in their Lordships' House would continue to press the matter on the attention of other Departments that had to deal with it, in the hope that many of the difficulties which stood in the way might possibly be overcome. More than that he was unable, at the present moment, to state. The matter was, no doubt, one of very considerable importance; but he was sure that the noble Earl and their Lordships generally would see that it was impossible that the Government could yet have had time to attend to it. He was very much obliged to the noble Earl for having brought the matter forward, and to the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Enfield) for having stated authoritatively the views of the Civil Service Commissioners. He (the Earl of Dunraven) could only say that the Colonial Office would not lose sight of the matter, in the hope that at some future time Her Majesty's Government might be able to come to some conclusion on the subject.

Lord EMLY said, he hoped the matter would be pressed forward with as little delay as possible.

PARLIAMENT — PALACE OF WESTMINSTER—HOUSE OF LORDS—THE FRESCOES IN THE PEERS' ROBING ROOM.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

Lord LAMINGTON asked Her Majesty's Government, What steps they intend to take to complete the frescoes in the Robing Room of the House of Lords? All who had visited that room must have been struck with admiration for the works of Art there painted by Mr. Herbert, R.A. The best judges of Art had classed them among the most remarkable paintings ever produced; and yet the series was left uncompleted. Some 20 years ago it was understood that the room was to be finished, and that a complete series of pictures was to be executed by Mr. Herbert. In the case of one of them—"Moses coming down from the Mount"—Mr. Herbert was very shamefully treated. The canvas was actually painted twice. Mr. Herbert, having undertaken to paint this series, refused a number of Continental engagements. Bearing these facts in mind, he thought the time had now come when their Lordships should make up their minds what was to be done.

The CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES (The Earl of Redesdale) said, that this matter had been before their Lordships' House on several occasions. After the careful consideration given by Mr. Herbert to the subjects of his pictures, and the enormous amount of time he had spent in their design, it would be obviously unfair to intrust the work to other hands.

Lord MOUNT-TEMPLE said, only one part of the scheme of decoration for the Palace of Westminster, recommended by the Fine Arts Commission under the direction of the Prince Consort, remained uncompleted. In this House, events appertaining to Royalty were depicted. In the Royal Gallery, the greatest victories by sea and land. In the Corridor, the struggles between Charles I. and his Parliament. In the Queen's Robing Room, the legends of King Arthur. In the Upper Hall, illustrations of the greatest English Poems. But the one Chamber which was devoted to Religious Art was the only one that remained incomplete. It was used as the Judicial Court of the Chairman of Committees. In the Central Panel was the giving of the law by Moses, the most consummate and admired work of the whole decoration, and universally recognized as a great achievement in design and colour and impressive power. It produced a vivid realization of that great event. On one side was the Judgment of Daniel, and on the two remaining sides only blank spaces. That left the room lop-sided and ill-balanced. Mr. Herbert's claim to complete the decoration, whenever a Vote should be taken for it, could not be overlooked. He had spent precious years in studying and preparing for the remaining subjects of the Judgment of Solomon and the Sermon on the Mount. At least, compensation would be due to him for the labour and thought he had expended in the execution entrusted to him by the Fine Arts Commission.

Lord FITZGERALD said, he felt bound to express his great sympathy with Mr. Herbert, who had practically for years past abandoned his profession and its profits, and given up his whole mind to the completion of the great works which he had so ably commenced. The first of the series, "The Descent of Moses from Mount Sinai," had, at the time, been pronounced to be the greatest of modern pictures. He hoped that the great artist would not now be thrown over, but would be allowed to complete the work he had undertaken.

Lord HENNIKER, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, said, that their Lordships were aware that that was not the first time that subject had been discussed in that House; and in order to make his reply complete he must refer to the debate of July 27, 1883, or rather to the reply given at the time for the Government by his noble Friend (Lord Thurlow). It appeared that in 1850 the Fine Art Commissioners entered into an agreement with Mr. Herbert to paint nine pictures for their Lordships' House for the sum of £9,000, which were to be completed in not less than 10 years after the Robing Room, where the pictures were to be painted, was ready for Mr. Herbert to work in. The room was not ready till 1858, and in 1864, when one of the finest pictures in the House, the magnificent picture of "Moses coming down from Mount Sinai," was finished, Mr. Herbert asked that the question of the amount of his remuneration should be reconsidered, on the ground that the system he had been compelled to adopt — the "water-glass" process for fresco-painting—had proved a failure—caused a great deal more labour, and involved the expenditure of a great deal more time, while the actual cost was a great deal more than was originally thought of. With respect to the remarks made by the noble Lord (Lord Lamington), he (Lord Henniker) believed the late Prince Consort did favour this process as the best to be adopted; but he was not aware that His Royal Highness in any way unduly pressed it upon Mr. Herbert. The question of the original agreement with the Fine Arts Commissioners was then referred to the Treasury by the First Commissioner of Works, who had at that time superseded the Commission, and the Treasury ordered an inquiry into the matter. The result of that inquiry was that the sum of £3,000 was paid to Mr. Herbert, in addition to the £2,000 already paid him, for the picture of Moses. In 1866 another agreement was made with Mr. Herbert to complete the picture of "The Judgment of Daniel" in three and a half years. The sum to be paid was £4,000, and the picture was to be handed over to the First Commissioner of Works in 1869, the agreement having been made early in 1866. As a matter of fact, Mr. Herbert did not hand it over to the First Commissioner by that time, and it was not handed over to him in a finished state till 1880, although he was very much pressed to complete the work. He might add that the original agreement of 1850 for the nine pictures was cancelled by a Treasury Letter in 1866, and Mr. Herbert then came to a distinct understanding that he had no further claim on the Government unless the other pictures proposed were proceeded with under a fresh contract. On consideration of these facts in 1883, the then First Commissioner of Works came to the conclusion that he could not hold out any hope whatever, or give any assurance that the request of Mr. Herbert to be allowed to finish the series of nine pictures would be acceded to, for the water-glass system was much more costly than the first proposal of fresco-painting, and caused an indefinite amount of delay. There was no one, either inside or outside the House, who appreciated more fully than his right hon. Friend (Mr. Plunket) the many merits of Mr. Herbert's paintings; paintings which had been justly praised in his own generation, and would certainly carry his name down to posterity as one of the greatest painters of the day. ["Hear, hear!"] He was sure their Lordships would agree with him in this expression of opinion. Nevertheless, after the most careful consideration on the part of the First Commissioner (Mr. Plunket), he had come to the conclusion that there was no reason to alter the decision of his Predecessor in 1883, not to call upon Mr. Herbert to execute his original designs. With regard to the finishing of the Robing Room, he was not aware that any scheme had been put forward, or any estimate made, for completing it; but if the noble Lord chose to put a Question at the beginning of next Session, no doubt the Chief Commissioner would be able to give an answer.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (The Earl of IDDESLEIGH) said, he wished to say a few words of an unofficial character, for the official answer had been given by his noble Friend (Lord Henniker), who had just spoken on behalf of the Department which was responsible in this matter. As a personal friend of Mr. Herbert for more than 40 years, and as one who had had an opportunity of knowing well the work he had done, he (the Earl of Iddesleigh) wished to make one observation with regard to the references which had been made to the length of time taken by Mr. Herbert in the accomplishment of his work. When Mr. Herbert undertook this work, it should be remembered that fresco-painting was almost a lost art in this country; and Mr. Herbert's undertaking created a great deal of sympathy, a great deal of expectation, and, at the same time, a great deal of very natural criticism. Their Lordships were aware that Mr. Herbert was frequently obliged to lay aside the work which he might otherwise have prosecuted on account of unforeseen difficulties, and questions that had to be solved—for instance, the question with regard to water-glass painting. If Mr. Herbert seemed a long time in completing the work he had undertaken, the circumstances must be taken more fully into consideration. He rose for the purpose of expressing his own sympathy and admiration for the great work Mr. Herbert had done in reviving what was supposed to be a lost art among us. Mr. Herbert had made himself a reputation which would last as long as that building endured, and a name which would be immortalized in the history of painting. Whatever disappointment Mr. Herbert might feel, no doubt the sympathy and admiration they all felt for him would be some compensation to him. While not wishing to interfere with the decision of the Office of Works, he would only say that the matter was one which, under any circumstances, and more especially in the peculiar circumstances under which Mr. Herbert completed his work, should be treated with the greatest consideration.

Lord EMLY said, he deeply regretted that Mr. Herbert was not permitted to complete the frescoes, a work which called forth the admiration of the world. He (Lord Emly) should be very much surprised if the unanimous wish of their Lordships was not to condemn the gross injustice that had been done.

DEFENCES OF THE EMPIRE—ARMAMENTS AND MUNITIONS OF WAR.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

Lord NAPIER of MAGDALA, in rising to ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether it would not be desirable to convene a Royal Commission to consider the present condition of the armaments and munitions of war in the United Kingdom and the Colonies, and what additions to them are necessary to meet any emergency or hostile combination? said, that taking into consideration the smallness of their Military Force, and the extent of the Empire it was called on to defend, it was imperative that they should be supplied with the very best weapon. Therefore, he had been impressed for a considerable time with the feeling that the proposal which he now presented for the consideration of their Lordships and of Her Majesty's Government was necessary, in order to ascertain if there were deficiencies in our military armaments and munitions of war; and, if so, that they might be brought to notice and remedied. There had been a feeling that our military stores had been allowed during the last six years to fall below a sound level. First among present demands stood the Artillery. The increased activity in the Navy, stimulated by the national demand, would require increased activity in the gun factories to supply the artillery for the new ships, and especially to supply the carriages for which heavy guns had too often had to wait. The Colonial ports and coaling stations, in addition to our home coast defences, made a heavy demand for guns of position. The newly-awakened consciousness of national weakness on our coasts would lead to much self-help; but in the matter of weapons the State must assist. No one who had observed the working in battery of heavy muzzle-loading guns could hesitate to demand breech-loaders; and the above considerations led to the conclusion that it would be better to enlarge our Government manufactories for the construction of guns and gun carriages, and our small-arm and gunpowder factories for fabricating materials on which we could thoroughly rely, than to be greatly dependent on external aid; and, also, for our Field Artillery, we must correct the error committed some 15 or 16 years ago in rejecting breech-loaders. The new field gun, which had been so highly approved, had to be supplied to a large part of the Artillery Forces. He understood, also, that a new rifle had been approved after the severest tests. Whether that weapon was to be adopted into the Service, or whether we should retain the Martini-Henry, a considerable strain must be put on our small-arm manufactories to maintain the supply for our Regular Army, and for the Reserve and Auxiliary Forces. It might be said that the requirements of the arsenals and manufactories could be well represented by the Departmental officers, who must know better than anyone else their own wants. In submitting those observations he (Lord Napier) was very far from implying any want of efficiency in the officers at the head of the Ordnance Department. On the contrary, he was impressed with the great ability of these officers, more especially of the Director General, General Alderson; but his duties were enormous, and it was difficult for a Departmental officer to initiate any considerable increase to his establishment. He could not move independently, being only able to act to the extent of what was supplied him. If he made recommendations he was apt to be regarded as overrating the wants of his particular Department. His opinions would be listened to with more attention if they were confirmed by the voice of an impartial Commission. He did not think it convenient to bring the subject forward when there appeared a prospect of a disturbance of the peaceful relations between Great Britain and some other countries. It was not at such a time that we should begin to make new weapons and new machinery; it was the time to turn to account the best weapons we possessed. But now, when there appeared no such strain or severe tension, it seemed the right and fitting time to put our house in order, and to proceed calmly and deliberately to correct any deficiencies rather than to wait for a time of danger, and then to hurry into contracts and preparations, which were more costly than in ordinary times, and were too often not completed in time for the occasion. The noble and gallant Lord concluded by asking the Question of which he had given Notice.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said, that he had a Motion down on the Paper for to-morrow with respect to the new arm; but probably it would be convenient if he were, on this occasion, allowed to make a few remarks on the subject which his noble and gallant Friend had brought before them. His noble and gallant Friend had done good service in calling attention to our want of stores and efficient guns, and he had not done so without ample grounds. His noble and gallant Friend recommended a Commission; but much good could hardly come of that, because, for many years past, there had been a perpetual series of Committees and Commissions. There was hardly a room in the War Office in which a War Office Commission had not sat at some time or other, and nothing came of them all. Another Commission would only lead to the same result. It seemed to him that Commissions served only as a screen to enable a Government not to do what they ought to do, and to shield those who ought to have done their duty without necessitating an inquiry as to why they did not. He would wish to have a Return of our stores and guns. The Government might not wish to give such a Return; but they might be sure that foreign nations knew the state of our stores and guns very well. None knew better than his noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for War (Viscount Bury) the deficiency of our supply of guns, and it was also notorious that our stock of small arms was very far from what it ought to be; and it was essential for the proper defence of the country that we should be well supported with guns, both large and small. The Militia and Volunteers were shortly to be armed with the Martini-Henry; and, when that was done, he would like to know how many were in store? He believed the amount would be very small; at any rate, not approaching what a nation like ours ought to have. It should be remembered that in the French War arms were taken by hundreds and thousands at a time. He believed that about 3,000 a-week was all we could turn out. It was notorious that the 40-pounder was now inferior to the 12-pounder and the 16-pounder, and steps ought to be taken to improve it. He pointed out last year that our present rifle at 2,000 yards made excellent practice, and it would be better to try and improve it than to have an entirely new weapon which would necessitate a break of gauge. The fact was, each Party as it came into Office tried to cut down expenditure, in order to make a good show with the Budget. That was the real reason why the armaments of the country were in their present condition. He should like to ask what course the Government intended to take with reference to the new arm?

LORD ELLENBOROUGH said, he hoped that, if the Commission was appointed, it would be an independent body. Had those who were responsible for these matters spoken out in the way they ought to have done, our Army would not now be in the position in which it was. It was absolutely necessary, if information was to be sought, that it should be from those who were hard-working soldiers, whose merits were too often overlooked, and not from those soldier politicians who had constantly held Staff appointments, and who had never for an hour commanded a regiment. It was absolutely necessary that something was done, for the Army had not been in the state in which it ought to have been as regarded its armament, and various other important particulars, for upwards of 25 years.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Viscount BURY) said, that no one could bring this subject forward with greater force than the noble and gallant Lord who introduced it (Lord Napier of Magdala). The noble Earl who followed him (the Earl of Wemyss) spoke of the re-armament of the Army with a particular rifle; and, for the sake of clearness, he (Viscount Bury) would dispose of that question first, and then address himself to the remarks of the noble and gallant Field Marshal. The noble Earl was himself a Member of the Committee which sat to consider the subject of a change of rifle for the Army. That Committee reported mainly and generally in favour of an improved arm. The matter, when the late Government left Office, appeared ripe for settlement; but it had not been settled. It, therefore, devolved upon the present Government to decide what should be done. His right hon. Friend at the head of the War Office could not take any decision of his Predecessors, but felt it his duty to examine the matter for himself; and, although there was a considerable consensus of opinion among military experts as to the advantage of having an improved weapon for the rank and file of the Army, that question had not yet been decided upon. The noble Lord on his right (Lord Ellenborough) had stated that the evidence of working soldiers should be taken on this matter. He (Viscount Bury) was quite in accord with the noble Lord on that point; and he might say that it was the very course which his right hon. Friend at the head of the War Office was about to adopt. The Papers and evidence with regard to this change of rifle had been to-day given into the hands of a small Committee, over which an officer well known to their Lordships' House would preside, Colonel Philip Smith. A more practical soldier than Colonel Smith could not be found. With him would be associated a couple more practical soldiers. He did not, of course, know what that Committee would decide; but, whatever it was, it would only be in the way of advice to the head of the War Office, who, after the Committee had reported, would form his own judgment upon the subject. That was the state of the case with regard to the re-armament of the troops with the new breech-loading rifle. He would now come to the somewhat larger question raised by the noble and gallant Field Marshal. The condition of the armaments and munitions of war had already occupied the serious attention of the Government. They found that their Predecessors had come to recognize the necessity for improved guns, and for a remedy in the matter of the deficiency of stores. He (Viscount Bury) was not there to say that the armaments were or were not in a satisfactory state; but he merely said that the matter had occupied the serious attention of the Government; that something had already been done in the time of their Predecessors; that more was now being done by the present Government; and that they hoped to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. He should like to give a general statement as to what had occurred. The following was the provision that was being made during the year on account of the Naval and Submarine Mining Services. The normal Vote amounted to £2,227,000, and the Vote of Credit to £2,360,000—making an available sum of £4,587,000. Of that, £2,227,000 was due to the normal Vote and £2,360,000 to the Vote of Credit. Of the latter sum, there was due to Egypt £800,000; this left £1,560,000; and there was due to the Navy £560,000, which left £1,000,000 available. There were sundry schemes for the supply and increase of armaments, which were provided for out of that £1,000,000 to the amount of £465,000, and that left of the Vote of Credit and the ordinary Estimates together about £500,000. That £500,000 would be allocated as follows:—Expended on rifles, which would be recovered on repayments, £100,000; small arms ammunition beyond previous programme, £100,000; acceleration of guns for land and sea services, £120,000; additional torpedoes for Navy and plant for increased manufacture, £85,000, which was far in advance of former years; making good loss on appropriations in aid, £50,000; and these items, with £45,000 for margin, account for the £500,000. It would be seen that very considerable advance had been made this year in the provision for stores, for ammunition, and for guns. He did not say that we were in a satisfactory position; but he did say that we were progressing towards that position. His right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for War had by no means lost sight of the importance of the subject, which had been before him ever since he entered upon his Office. This appropriation of £500,000 for increased armaments would leave to be provided next year the sum of £250,000 for a further reserve of stores, and that would not exhaust the demands upon the Treasury, for there would probably be in future years a permanent addition of £150,000 on account of these extra stores. As to Field Artillery, he was not able to quote from the Report he had in his hand, because it had not yet been laid on the Table; but of Field Artillery we had a very considerable provision, and we had enough to send a considerable number of guns to India if they were required. As to 40-pounder guns, there was a 40-pounder which was new and which was a breech-loader—it was a gun of very great power and accuracy—and of that we had a considerable store. It was not at all a contemptible arm. With regard to mountain guns, we had seven batteries—that was, 42 new guns this year; and there was the material for turning them out at a considerable rate. A considerable addition had been made to the plant, and the Secretary of State for War was inclined to add still further to that arm. We were very fairly off for siege guns. As to the reserve of small arms, it was true that with the arming of the Volunteers and the Militia with the Martini-Henry rifle, the reserve of small arms had fallen below what it ought to be. At present we were turning out about 3,000 a-week. Alterations were being made in the mode of working, which would bring the turn-out to about 4,000 a-week. This was the normal position; but by night shifts and other arrangements we could turn out double the number. We should practically have about 20,000 of these Martini-Henrys in store, and we should go on manufacturing them as rapidly as we could. He thought his noble Friends might dismiss from their minds that they would be caught napping in this respect. Nothing had been decided as to the arming of the Army with a new gun; and, therefore, the production of the Martini-Henry would go on with all possible speed. The idea of appointing a Royal Commission did not commend itself to the Secretary of State. He was engaged almost day and night in investigating the condition of affairs for himself; and he felt that while he was doing that the appointment of a Commission could hardly have a satisfactory result. If he afterwards found it necessary to seek the assistance of a Commission, he would be most happy to do so. But at present he hoped that a Motion for a Commission would not be pressed.

LORD WAVENEY said, he had no doubt as to whether the Martini-Henry rifle was an arm adequate for the defence of the Empire. If they ought to have a store of 800,000 stand of arms, at the rate they were making them—4,000 a-week—it would take four years to have that quantity ready. He wished to warn the Government against allowing alterations and improvements to bring about delays.

LORD NAPIER OF MAGDALA said, he should like to know how many field guns could be sent to India, and whether they were of the latest breech-loading pattern? He would also observe that though the sum reserved for heavy guns no doubt required an effort, and was so far satisfactory, it would not go very far to meet the demand for the foreign ports and coaling stations. It was satisfactory to know that the Secretary of State for War had given his serious attention to the subject; and, therefore, he would not press the Motion for a Royal Commission.

VISCOUNT BURY, in reply, said, there were 271 muzzle-loading guns of 16 lbs.

WATERWORKS CLAUSES ACT (1847) AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 127.)

(*The Viscount Enfield.*)

THIRD READING.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Viscount Enfield.*)

LORD BRAMWELL said, he wished to raise a last, and he feared an unavailing, protest against a measure which was wholly unjust in principle, and the proceedings in which had been of a most unusual character. The Bill was grossly unjust, and would cause much misery. It altered the Private Acts of eight different Water Companies supplying the Metropolis. It altered the private bargains which those Companies had made with the public, and the Bill was in reality a Private Bill, and would have been so treated if the Companies had themselves proposed alterations of a like character. And the alteration in those Acts would operate to the grievous loss of the Companies and their shareholders, many of whom depended wholly for their maintenance on the dividends received on their shares. The income of these poor people would be diminished by one-fifth. There had been no complaints of the Water Companies; and no Petitions, except from Vestries which did not understand the question, and would be glad to reduce the income of Water Companies as low as possible, had been presented in favour of the Bill. The Companies would be obliged to charge on assessments as to which they had no voice. Everybody else was entitled to appeal against an assessment; but in consequence of the time at which that Bill would be passed it would be too late to appeal, and the Companies would be subjected to this gross injustice for the next five years. If this Bill had been referred in the proper way to a Select Committee, witnesses would have been examined and the subject properly thrashed out. But that course was not followed, and this great wrong was to be perpetrated. The Water Companies had done their best, and it was a very remarkable fact that out of their 700,000 customers they had only had 50 complaints settled by the magistrates, and that all those cases except two were settled in favour of the Companies. As he had said, the Bill would work a grievous amount of injustice, and he could not believe their Lordships could understand its injurious and unfair effect. He begged to oppose the Motion.

LORD TRURO said, he deeply admired the courage and persistency of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Bramwell) in fighting the battle of the Water Companies as he had done, although it was *ad misericordiam;* but he must call the noble and learned Lord's attention to the fact that, while doing so, he had wholly ignored the extortion in the shape of exorbitant overcharge practised by those Companies for a great number of years. He (Lord Truro) would impress upon their Lordships that there was great necessity that the Bill should pass.

VISCOUNT ENFIELD said, his noble and learned Friend (Lord Bramwell) had used such strong terms in regard to this Bill that he must recall their Lordships' attention to the history of the measure. It was before the other House of Parliament for four months, and the third reading was passed without opposition.

LORD BRAMWELL, interposing, said, that the Bill certainly did not pass without opposition.

VISCOUNT ENFIELD said, he thought he was correct in saying that the third reading was passed without opposition. It was true, however, that there was an important division in Committee, on the question whether the Bill should be treated as a Public Bill or not. When it came to that House, the noble Earl who presided over their Lordships' Committees (the Earl of Redesdale) did not treat it as a private measure, and consequently it came before them as a Public Bill. After having been read the second time without a division, it was referred to an impartial Committee, who heard an able representative of the Water Companies, and reported the Bill without Amendment to the House. He hoped it would be passed.

LORD FITZGERALD said, that his noble and learned Friend (Lord Bramwell) and the noble Earl on the Cross Benches (the Earl of Wemyss) had reiterated the arguments against this Bill several times over, and had asked their Lordships to reverse their previous decisions. For himself, he could not understand such a course of action. What had been advanced on behalf of the Water Companies only went to show that for years they had been taking too much. What his noble and learned Friend denounced as spoliation was this —No person being appointed to make a valuation under the Act of 1847, the Water Companies made valuations for themselves, and on that footing they continued to charge until a case was brought forward by a gentleman named Dobbs. Then it was decided by their Lordships' House, in an eloquent and conclusive judgment, delivered by his noble and learned Friend, that annual value meant net annual value. This Bill was a consequence of that judgment.

Lord BRAMWELL said, he wished to entirely deny the assertion that the judgment in the Dobbs case had anything at all to do with this matter.

On Question? *agreed to:* Bill read 3ª accordingly, and *passed.*

MEDICAL RELIEF DISQUALIFICATION REMOVAL BILL.—OBSERVATIONS.

Earl GRANVILLE said, it would be convenient to their Lordships if he took that opportunity of asking the noble Earl who had given Notice with regard to the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Bill (the Earl of Milltown) whether, after what had passed, he intended to adhere to that Notice? He (Earl Granville) did not remember a similar course being taken in their Lordships' House; but there were three noble Lords on the Treasury Bench opposite who had had large experience in the House of Commons, and probably they would be able to say whether such a course was ever taken there. The Bill having come up that day to their Lordships' House was, like all other Bills coming up from the House of Commons, read a first time. Then the noble Earl suddenly jumped up and, referring to the Bill as a derelict, gave Notice of his intention to take charge of it. He (Earl Granville) did not think the Bill was exactly a derelict, and it would have been more reasonable if the noble Earl, before coming down there at half-past 3——

The Earl of MILLTOWN, interrupting, begged the noble Earl's pardon. The noble Earl had been misinformed, for he had not come down at half-past 3 for the purpose of giving the Notice.

Earl GRANVILLE, continuing, said, that he would not say half-past 3; but before the House met, the noble Earl came down with the Notice which he subsequently gave when he was in Order in doing so. Now, the noble Earl, as far as he (Earl Granville) was aware, was not requested by anyone to take charge of the Bill, and he did not know that he had any connection with it. The House was aware of the circumstances under which the Bill passed through its later stages in the House of Commons. When the Government refused any further responsibility for it, he (Earl Granville) was asked by Sir William Harcourt and Mr. Jesse Collings to take charge of it in their Lordships' House. He was, therefore, prepared to do so. If, however, the noble Earl opposite had been requested by the Government to take the course he had taken, and if, as he was told, the noble Earl was very anxious to pass it in its present shape, he (Earl Granville) would think it in better hands than his own, and would gladly resign it to the noble Earl. But if the noble Earl had not received any such instruction from Her Majesty's Government he (Earl Granville) thought he was bound to acquiesce in the wish which had been expressed to him by those who passed the Bill in the House of Commons.

The Earl of MILLTOWN said, that he simply adhered to his previous statement. The noble Earl (Earl Granville) had said that the course he (the Earl of Milltown) had taken was unprecedented; but it was also unprecedented that a Bill which had been in the charge of the Government should come up to their Lordships' House as this one had. The noble Earl also said that he had been requested by Mr. Jesse Collings and Sir William Harcourt to take charge of the Bill. It seemed to be thought, from what the noble Earl had said, that Sir William Harcourt had moved the third reading of the Bill in the other House. As a matter of fact, however, the noble Earl was misinformed, for the third reading was moved by Mr. Jesse Collings; and neither Sir William Harcourt nor any other Member of the late Government was present at the time. He could not see what reason the noble Earl had for looking on the Bill with so much favour and veneration, considering that it contained a clause which was not in the Bill of the late Government.

Earl GRANVILLE said, they had better not go into the provisions of the Bill.

The Earl of MILLTOWN said, he merely referred to it because he was giving his reasons for taking charge of the Bill. The noble Earl wanted to know why he took charge of it. He had taken it up as an independent Conservative Peer who was in favour of the provisions it contained; and he might say that he had no communication with the Government on the subject, and did not believe that one of his Friends on the Government Bench had any idea of what he intended to do. He never imagined that the noble Earl (Earl Granville) would wish to take charge of it, and he did not see how on earth he could, seeing that the Bill was so different from the proposals of the late Government. It was true that, having other business to attend to in the Library in the way of looking up references, he had come down to the House at half-part 3, and incidentally mentioned to the Clerk of the Parliaments that he proposed to take up the Bill if it arrived from the Commons, and that he would move the second reading to-morrow. But the Clerk of the Parliaments told him that there might be a difficulty in doing so, as the Bill might perhaps not be printed by to-morrow, and then he put it down for Thursday. But when the noble Earl said that he would move the second reading on Tuesday, then he gave Notice himself for Tuesday. Why the noble Earl objected to what had been done, if he really desired to see the Bill passed, he could not understand. It was not a Party measure, as it had been supported by both sides, and he had only done what he was entitled to do; and he intended, as an independent Conservative Peer, to move the second reading to-morrow.

EARL GRANVILLE said, as he understood the noble Earl had not been asked by the Government to take charge of the Bill, he (Earl Granville) should adhere to the Notice he had given, and would move the second reading to-morrow.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, that perhaps the noble Earl was not aware of the Standing Order on the subject. Standing Order No. 18 was to the effect that all Orders and Notices should stand according to priority of Notice; and that if a noble Lord gave Notice to the Clerk of the Parliaments that he intended to make a Motion, it should so be printed in the Orders of the Day. He had altered his Notice in consequence of the statement of the noble Earl.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that the Standing Order showed that he was entirely in his right; because he gave Notice that he would move the second reading to-morrow.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN: After me.

EARL GRANVILLE: No; the noble Earl opposite gave Notice afterwards that he would do so. However, putting that aside, the Standing Orders must be read with some regard to common sense; for instance—and he appealed to noble Lords on the Government Benches, and especially to those who had had experience in both Houses—would it be held permissible that any noble Lord might, by giving Notice in the way the noble Earl had done now, entirely block out the persons really connected with the Bill. In this case the promoters of the Bill wished that he (Earl Granville) should take charge of it.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Viscount CRANBROOK) said, that once before a question arose as to dealing with the Orders of the House, and the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) spoke on that occasion as if a noble Lord had a right to take possession of a Bill. It was the courtesy of the House that when an Order was put down in the name of a particular Lord that noble Lord should deal with it. Their Lordships made their own Standing Orders; and if the noble Earl wished them to be changed in any way—for instance, if he intended to proceed against the noble Earl who had priority of Notice—it must be done by a Motion. In that case it would be for the House itself to decide.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, he had given Notice for Thursday, in consequence of what had been said to him by the Clerk of the Parliaments; but as soon as the noble Earl (Earl Granville) objected to the delay he agreed to alter it to to-morrow. However, the noble Earl was still discontented, and said he himself would move it to-morrow. He (the Earl of Milltown) maintained that his own Notice had been given first.

EARL GRANVILLE: I do not desire any alteration in the Standing Order. I have already given Notice that I shall move the second reading of the Bill to-morrow.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Viscount CRANBROOK) said, in that case, he would ask the Clerk of the Parliaments who gave Notice first?

The CLERK of the PARLIAMENTS (*Sir William Rose*) said, that the Notice of the Earl of Milltown stood first.

EARL GRANVILLE: Stands first for Thursday, but not for Tuesday.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, he must again say he gave Notice of his Motion for Thursday; but in consequence of what had fallen from the noble Earl he had altered it to Tuesday. After that the noble Earl was still discontented, and said he would move it himself.

THE LORD PRESIDENT (Viscount CRANBROOK): But who stands in the Order Book for the first place to-morrow?

LORD MONSON said, that his noble Friend (Earl Granville) came into the House after the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Milltown) had given Notice for Thursday. He (Lord Monson) told his noble Friend what had taken place, and the noble Earl, in a state of surprise, said—"Why, the Bill was committed to me." Then his noble Friend got up and said he would move the second reading to-morrow, thus having precedence of the noble Earl opposite, and then the noble Earl opposite said he would alter the day.

THE EARL OF LONGFORD said, the noble Lord opposite (Lord Monson) was not quite correct. The noble Earl (Earl Granville) did not give Notice, but said —"I was just going to move the second reading to-morrow." In fact, no Notice was given by the noble Earl opposite until after the Notice of his noble Friend (the Earl of Milltown).

LORD FITZGERALD, after reviewing the history of the Bill, said, that his noble Friend opposite (the Earl of Milltown), who had no connection with the Bill, assumed possession, and gave Notice of the second reading for Thursday; and then his noble Friend near him (Earl Granville), who was requested to take charge of the Bill, objected to Thursday, and he put down his Motion for to-morrow. The noble Earl (the Earl of Milltown) subsequently put down a Notice for to-morrow also. The Standing Orders did not affect the question in the least. What the Standing Orders said was, that the Notices of Motion should be recorded on the Minutes in the order in which they were given in. He would make an appeal to his noble Friend opposite. There was such a thing as courtesy in that House, and it was only consistent with courtesy to leave the matter in the hands of the noble Earl who had been given charge of the Bill by the parties who had the right to do so. He hoped that the noble Earl opposite would not forget what was due to the courtesy of the House. One thing, however, appeared to be clear from the action of noble Lords opposite, and that was that the passing of this Bill was assured.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (The Earl of IDDESLEIGH): I do not profess to be able to decide anything with regard to the order of your Lordships' House; but as the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) has referred to me, among others, as having had experience in the House of Commons, I should wish to say that, so far as the proceedings of the House of Commons are concerned, I believe it to be an entirely unprecedented and disorderly thing for a Bill which has been revived, and on which an Order has been moved by one Member, that another Member should come in and make another proposal in regard to the same measure. The noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition may have thought he had acquired the right to fix the Bill for Tuesday; but the Bill having already been fixed for this day by my noble Friend (the Earl of Milltown), according to the proceedings of the House of Commons, the noble Earl would certainly have no right to take it out of the hands of my noble Friend.

LORD FITZGERALD: There is no Order made. It is a mere Notice of Motion for an Order.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (The Earl of IDDESLEIGH): My noble Friend (the Earl of Milltown) gave the Notice, and thereby placed himself in charge of the Bill, and the Motion was made by the noble Earl, and, as I understood, taken down by the Clerk at the Table. That undoubtedly would, in the practice of the House of Commons, be giving precedence to the Member who had so taken charge of the Bill. But there appears to be some inaccuracy in the statement of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Fitzgerald) as to what passed in the House of Commons. A Bill was introduced by Mr. Jesse Collings on the subject, which, after certain progress had been made, was superseded by another brought in by the Government, and which has now come up to your Lordships' House. Undoubtedly, an important change was made in the Bill during its progress through the House of Commons, and my right hon. Friend the Leader of that House stated that, in consequence, the Government could take no more interest in the Bill there; and, therefore, they did not take an active part in the third reading. But neither did the Colleagues of the noble Earl opposite. The proceedings closed by a Motion made by Mr. Jesse Collings for the third reading of the Bill, and that Motion was carried without any objection. In that way the Government, represented by my right hon. Friend (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), fulfilled their obligations in the matter by saying they were not prepared to take an interest in the Bill, neither were they prepared to vote against it. Accordingly, the Bill was left in the hands of the House, and the third reading was carried without a division. It thereupon comes up here, and then the noble Earl (the Earl of Milltown), who has himself always supported the measure in the shape in which it comes here, says he will move the second reading of the Bill on a given date. He is quite entitled to make such a Motion, and I should have thought that the fact of his giving Notice would entitle him to precedence in making it.

EARL GRANVILLE: When I asked the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Iddesleigh) whether there was any precedent in the House of Commons, I meant was there any precedent in the case of a Bill coming down from the Lords to the Commons, and the Leader of a Party in the Commons of the same political opinions being requested to take charge of it, it was competent for an independent Member to slip in and try to insert his own name instead. I must own I am a little disappointed at the line which the noble Earl has taken. I have had the honour of representing my Party for a long time in this House; and I believe I should have been perfectly incapable, if the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury) had informed the House that he desired to take charge of the Bill at the request of his Friends in the House of Commons, and one of my best Friends and Supporters had managed to slip in his name before that of the noble Marquess—I say I should have been incapable of not making the strongest appeal to my Friend not to take so unusual, and I must say so unprecedented, a course.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Viscount CRANBROOK): The noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition has been all throughout treating this as a question of right; but upon that question of right he is undoubtedly wrong.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Do I gather from the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) that some intimation had come to me from my Friends in the House of Commons to the effect that I should take up the Bill?

EARL GRANVILLE: No; I did not say that. I was only suggesting a hypothetical case.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Then I am mistaken. I had no idea that the noble Earl wished to take up this Bill.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN: I should like to say that I also had not the slightest idea that the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) intended to take up the Bill, as the late Government not only did not insert any provision in their Bill such as that moved by Mr. Jesse Collings when it came up to this House, but opposed the Amendment moved by Mr. Davey. How could I know, in those circumstances, that the noble Earl would take up such a Bill as this? There was nothing to show that he took any interest in it. On the contrary, I had always taken an interest in it, and it has always been supported on the Conservative side of both Houses of Parliament. It was not a Party Bill in any sense of the term; and I did not see why I should not have come down in the regular manner and given Notice in accordance with the Standing Order. I did so; and I cannot see, after I had given Notice to the Clerk of the Parliaments that I intended to move the second reading, and after the Clerk had called upon me to give my Notice—I say I cannot see how on earth the noble Earl could object to my action. I gave Notice that I would move the second reading on Thursday; and the noble Earl then stated that time was of importance, and that he intended to have moved that the second reading be taken on Tuesday. I thereupon said that I should be most happy to meet his wishes, and put down the second reading for Tuesday. He replied that that did not suit his wishes; and he gave Notice that he would put the Bill down himself for Tuesday. In any case, I contend that the noble Earl's Motion was subsequent to my own.

EARL GRANVILLE: The noble Earl's chronology seems to be defective. I said that I intended to put the Bill down on Tuesday, and I did give Notice for to-morrow.

VISCOUNT BURY: There is another point of Order which I venture to submit. One noble Lord having given Notice to make a certain Motion on a particular day, is it competent for another noble Lord to give Notice of the same Motion for an earlier day?

EARL GRANVILLE: Does the noble Viscount seriously mean to say that, after a Bill has been read a first time, any person, however hostile he may be to the Bill, can jump up and fix his own day for the second reading, a day which may be beyond that on which it would probably be taken at all, and that the person who is friendly to the Bill cannot fix an earlier day? The proposition is absurd.

LORD DE ROS said, an appeal had been made to the Clerk of the Parliaments, who stated that the noble Earl below (the Earl of Milltown) had given Notice first; therefore he did not see why this irregular discussion should be continued.

The CLERK of the PARLIAMENTS (Sir William Rose): I received no written Notice. A verbal one was given to me by the Earl of Milltown, who told me that he wished to put down the second reading for to-morrow; and afterwards, when I told the noble Earl that there might be some difficulty about printing the Bill, he said he would put it down for Thursday.

EARL GRANVILLE: Precisely; the noble Earl put it down for Thursday, and I put mine down for Tuesday.

THE MARQUESS OF LOTHIAN: Whatever may be the view entertained as to the courtesy of the matter, it is certainly not in accordance with the usual practice of the House, when one noble Lord puts down a Motion for one day, for another noble Lord to put down the same Motion for an earlier day, though there may be occasions when it might not be desirable to adhere too closely to the rule. As this discussion has gone on for some time without any definite result, I venture to suggest, as the only way of deciding the question at issue, that the opinion of the House should be taken as to whether the Motion should stand in the name of the noble Earl on this side of the House, or in that of the noble Earl opposite.

LORD BRAMWELL: I distinctly heard what took place, and I can declare that my noble Friend (Earl Granville) gave a distinct Notice for Tuesday, when the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Milltown) had left his Notice for Thursday. I thought that the noble Earl's public Notice was a mark of his wish to associate himself with the Bill. That was what impressed it upon my mind. I also took particular notice of the Motion made by the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition, which fixed Tuesday for the second reading. That, as I take it, is how the matter stood—namely, that the noble Earl opposite gave Notice for Thursday, and the noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition gave Notice for Tuesday. But apart from all this, is it not desirable, as a matter of common sense, that those who promoted the Bill, and who have conducted it to a successful termination in one House of Parliament, should select someone to take charge of it in the other House?

THE EARL OF LIMERICK: My recollection is quite different from that of the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Bramwell). The noble Earl the Leader of the Opposition, after the Notice fixing the Bill for Thursday had been given, expressed a wish that the second reading should be taken on Tuesday. The noble Earl who gave Notice for Thursday agreed to alter his Motion and insert Tuesday. I think it most desirable that this irregular discussion should come to some sort of end. I will, therefore, move that the Motion of the Earl of Milltown should have precedence.

Moved, "That the Earl of Milltown have precedence."—(*The Earl of Limerick.*)

LORD THURLOW said, he understood that the question was set at rest by the declaration of the Clerk of the Parliaments.

On Question.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he would not trouble their Lordships to divide; but he must say that the course taken was a most unusual one, to say the least of it.

Motion *agreed to.*

House adjourned at a quarter before Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, Four o'clock.

* * *

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 27th July, 1885.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee* Army Estimates, Votes 10 to 25; Civil Service Estimates—Class III.—Law and Justice, Vote 17; Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art, Votes 3, 12, 13; Class VII.—Miscellaneous, Votes 1, 2; £250,000, Grant in Aid, Afghan War—Revenue Departments; Class I.—Public Works and Buildings, Votes 2, 18, 20, 26; Class III.—Law and Justice, Votes 8, 20; Class V.—Foreign and Colonial Services, Vote 6; Class VII.—Miscellaneous.

Resolutions [July 24] *reported.*

Private Bill (*by Order*)—*Considered as amended* Edinburgh Extension and Sewerage.

Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Lunacy Acts Amendment [244]; Metropolitan Police Staff Superannuation * [246]; Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment [250].

Committee—Patent Law Amendment [240]—r.p.; Prevention of Crimes Amendment [93], *debate adjourned.*

Committee—Report—Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) [99-251].

Committee — Report — Third Reading — Evidence by Commission [238], and *passed.*

Considered as amended—Customs and Inland Revenue (No. 2) [223].

Considered as amended — Third Reading — Pluralities * [22-241], and *passed.*

Third Reading—Poor Law Unions' Officers (Ireland) * [214], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Deeds of Arrangement Registration * [225]; Trustees Relief * [83].

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

—o—

EDINBURGH EXTENSION AND SEWERAGE BILL [*Lords*] (*by Order*).

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Mr. WEBSTER, in moving to insert the following sub-section in Clause 36 (for protection of estate of Craigentinny):—

> "(4.) Nothing in this section contained shall limit or affect the provisions of any public Act of Parliament relating to the suppression of nuisance, or for the preservation of the public health,"

said, he proposed the Amendment on behalf of his hon. Friend the Member for Leith (Mr. A. Grant), who was unable to be present. He supported the Amendment because it enunciated a distinct principle which it was essential, in the interests of every large community, to carry out; and he felt the House would not object to the few observations he proposed to make in bringing the matter under their consideration. In the first place, he wished to say that nothing could be further from his intention than to complain in the slightest degree of the Committee which had inquired into the merits of the Bill. The object of the Bill, which was promoted by the Municipal Corporation of Edinburgh, was to extend the municipal and police boundaries of that city, to purify certain streams in the locality, and to intercept and convey the sewage from the Jordan or Powburn to the sea. The rider which he proposed to insert in the Bill had been sent to the Corporation of Leith by the Corporation of Edinburgh, as one to be proposed by Edinburgh in Committee; but it had not been laid before the Committee at all. That formed the objection to the Bill as it stood, and the justification for the explanation he was about to give to the House. The misunderstanding on the subject between the Corporation of Edinburgh and the public health sanitary authority of Leith had arisen out of a letter addressed by the Parliamentary agent of the promoters on the 14th instant to the Parliamentary agent of the Corporation of Leith. The Bill proposed to construct a sewer to carry the sewage of the south districts of Edinburgh to the territory of the local public health authorities of Leith, discharging it in the sea at Leith. As guardians of the public health, the Corporation of Leith considered that this proposal was detrimental to Leith in a sanitary respect; and they opposed the Bill both in the House of Lords, where it originated, and in the Select Committee of the House of Commons, who considered it on the 15th and 16th of the present month. In the House of

Lords an arrangement had been made with Mr. Christie Miller, an opponent outside the Royal burgh of Leith, the owner of the well-known meadows of Craigentinny, through which the sewage was to pass. It was arranged that Mr. Miller was to have free access to the contents of the sewer in order that he might withdraw those contents for the irrigation of his meadows. Dr. Letheby, in 1872, spoke in condemnation of the scheme of irrigation then carried on as prejudicial to public health, and the proposal of the Bill to give Mr. Miller free access to the contents of this sewer, could only be an aggravation of the evil. The Preamble of the Bill was passed by the House of Lords, and the 36th clause was also passed notwithstanding the opposition of the Corporation of Leith. The Bill was to come before a Select Committee of the House of Commons on the 15th of July. On the 14th the Parliamentary agent for the promoters addressed a letter to the Corporation of Leith which formed the groundwork of the present Motion. The letter was addressed to the Parliamentary agent of the Corporation of Leith, and was as follows:—

"Westminster, 14th July, 1885.

EDINBURGH EXTENSION AND SEWERAGE.

"Dear Sir,—I inclose copy of an addition which will be proposed in Committee to Clause 36.—Yours, &c., JOHN GRAHAM.

A. BEVERIDGE, ESQ.

(Inclosure.)

Rider to Clause 36.

"(4.) Nothing in this section contained shall limit or affect the provisions of any public Act of Parliament relating to the suppression of nuisance or for the preservation of the public health."

He asked the House to notice that this was exactly the proposal he intended to submit, and the Corporation of Leith had implicitly relied on the statement of Mr. Graham that the rider to Clause 36 would be proposed to the Committee by the promoters themselves. Relying upon that understanding the Corporation of Leith withdrew from further opposition to the Preamble of the Bill; but after the Preamble was affirmed they opposed Clause 36, which gave the right to intercept the sewage in its passage down the sewer to Mr. Miller for the purpose of being distributed upon the Craigentinny meadows. As soon as Clause 36 was passed by the Committee the Corporation of Leith retired from all further opposition to the Bill, trusting to the unqualified undertaking of the promoters, unasked for, and without condition, that this rider would be proposed, and, of course, inserted. But it was not so—the rider was not proposed or submitted to the Committee at all, and the Bill passed without it. So entirely had the Corporation of Leith trusted to the undertaking of the Parliamentary agent of the promoters of the Bill that although the Bill passed without it on the 1[illegible]th of July, it was not until the 24th of July when the Bill came to be examined by the Commissioners for the Port of Leith that it was discovered, for the first time, that the rider had not been inserted. Mr. Beveridge, the Parliamentary agent of the Corporation of Leith, immediately complained and asked for an explanation; but in the correspondence which followed between the two Parliamentary agents he (Mr. Webster) could not see that the least explanation of the omission to carry out the unqualified undertaking to the Corporation of Leith to induce them to withdraw their opposition to the Bill was given. It was not necessary to read all the letters which passed; but on the 24th of July Mr. Graham wrote this letter to Mr. Beveridge—

EXTENSION AND SEWERAGE.

"Dear Sir,—I have received your second letter. The rider to Clause 36 was originally intended to be inserted in Committee; but as the Committee passed the Preamble without qualification, and as Mr. Christie Miller, the person with whom Clause 36 was agreed, strongly objected to the rider, we did not propose it to the Committee, I decline, on behalf of my clients, to insert it now.—Yours, &c.,

"JOHN GRAHAM."

In other words, the promoters found that everything in the Bill suited their purpose. The Preamble had been passed, Mr. Miller had been squared, and Clause 36 had been passed; and, notwithstanding the undertaking which had been given to the Corporation of Leith, the rider to protect that Corporation had been omitted. The Parliamentary agent did not even say that the Corporation of Edinburgh had any objection to the insertion of the rider. He said that Mr. Miller strongly objected to it; but that objection was never communicated to the Corporation of Leith. It was quite clear that they were purposely left in ignorance of it, and the omission took place entirely behind their backs. Mr. Miller, the owner of the Craigentinny meadows, desired to have access to the sewage, and it was only natural that he should object to the insertion of this sub-section, the object of which was to prevent the general sanitary provisions of the law from being over-ridden by a Private Act of Parliament. Mr. Miller was a man who gained by the omission; and, therefore, he would not object to the silence of the Corporation of Edinburgh, and to the fact that they said nothing in defence of having broken their promise. Mr. Miller's demands were altogether antagonistic to those of the Corporation of Leith; and he (Mr. Webster) asked whether the House should not now remedy this omission, which, to say the least of it, bore the appearance of an act of injustice to the Corporation of Leith? It could only be remedied by inserting the rider in the Bill in some form or other. There would be no delay in the passing of the Bill. He would only say, in conclusion, that the Corporation of Leith feared that without this rider they might, in some sense, be deprived of the benefit of the public Statutes which they enjoyed at present; and they were strengthened in this belief by the statement that Mr. Miller, whom the omission of the rider would benefit, had strongly objected to its being inserted. Mr. Miller would not take that course unless he had obtained the point he desired. He begged now to move the insertion of the sub-section which he had placed upon the Paper.

DR. FARQUHARSON seconded the Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 15, after line 22, to insert, as new sub-section, the words—"(4.) Nothing in this section contained shall limit or affect the provisions of any public Act of Parliament relating to the suppression of nuisance or for the preservation of the public health."—(*Mr. Webster.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Sir ARTHUR OTWAY) said, it was, perhaps, desirable that he should state the course which he thought the House ought to pursue. He was sure the question had lost nothing by the advocacy of the hon. Member in the absence of the hon. Member for Leith (Mr. A. Grant). His hon. Friend had stated his case with great clearness. There was no difference of opinion as to the result—the only difference was, how that result had been brought about. No doubt any matter that affected the sanitary condition of a population as large as that of Leith was of the greatest importance; but the course proposed by his hon. Friend was an unusual one; and, as the result he wished to attain could be brought about in another mode, he was sure his hon. Friend would readily agree with the course he was about to propose. The insertion of a clause, or of a proviso to a clause, touching the interests of a petitioner who had been settled with by the promoters, would be a most unusual course, and it was by no means desirable to include the provision of the Public Health Act in a Private Bill. The Bill itself ought to be so drawn as not to touch public interests protected by a Public Act, and he understood that the clause complained of did not exempt the promoters of the Bill from the provisions of the Public Health Act. The Committee, he was informed, had declined to touch Clause 36 for very excellent reasons. They were of opinion that if the terms made with Mr. Christie Miller were altered the agreement would be rendered invalid. The course he recommended, and which would really effect the purpose of his hon. Friend, was at once more respectful to the Committee, who were Members of considerable experience, and more in conformity with the usages and procedure of the House. Instead of inserting the sub-section moved by his hon. Friend, he proposed to move the re-committal of the Bill in order that the Committee might again consider the question, with an Instruction to them to deal with the matter, and this matter only. By that means the whole question would be fairly considered; the Committee would take those steps which they were most competent to take, and there would be no abuse of the Forms of the House. He, therefore, asked his hon. Friend to withdraw his proposition, and to accept his (Sir Arthur Otway's)—namely, that the Bill should be re-committed, with an Instruction to the Committee to deal with the sanitary question only.

MR. C. S. PARKER said that, as one of the Committee who had considered the Bill, he saw no objection to the course proposed by his right hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means, unless it were on the score of time. The sanitary interests of Leith had not been overlooked. The clause in question was arranged by Edinburgh with a landed proprietor; but the Committee—and he was speaking in the presence of his Colleagues, who would correct him if he were wrong—would not have sanctioned it without further inquiry, if they had not been assured of this—that it would not override the general law and the general power of the Sanitary Authority at Leith to protect Leith. That point was expressly discussed before the Committee. A Member of the Committee asked if words could not be inserted in the clause to protect the rights of the Corporation of Leith, and the counsel for the promoters said they could. So if that provision had been omitted on account of some misunderstanding, and if the Bill were sent back to the Committee as proposed, he had no doubt the matter would be satisfactorily dealt with, time permitting.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES observed, that the Committee could obtain leave to proceed forthwith, so that there would be no loss of time at all.

MR. BUCHANAN said, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Ways and Means would give some assurance to the House that the interests of the Bill would not be prejudiced by the delay involved in its re-commitment. Anything that would endanger the Bill would be a very serious matter; but if there had been an oversight, and there was time to rectify it, after the opinion which had been expressed by the Chairman of Ways and Means and the hon. Member for Perth (Mr. Parker), he thought the best course would be to recommit the Bill.

MR. J. G. TALBOT said, as Chairman of the Committee on Police and Sanitary Regulations, to whom this Bill had been referred, he wished to endorse what had been said by his hon. Friend the Member for Perth (Mr. Parker). He must, however, protest against the course taken by the hon. Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Webster) as an evil precedent, disturbing the decisions of a Committee carefully arrived at. Such a course could only be justified under very exceptional circumstances. He thought the course proposed by the Chairman of Ways and Means was a very reasonable one. He was still of opinion that the clause which had been inserted in the Bill would not prejudice the powers of the Corporation of Leith under the provisions of the Public Health Act; but to prevent any misunderstanding between the two Corporations of Edinburgh and Leith, if words saving the rights of the Corporation of Leith had been accidentally omitted he saw no objection to their being inserted. The Committee would see that no damage was done to the Corporation of Leith. What the hon. Member for Perth (Mr. Parker) had said was perfectly true, that the Committee were unwilling to interfere with the arrangement which had been come to between the promoters of the Bill and Mr. Miller, because any such interference might have led to misunderstanding and to the revival of the whole opposition. That was the main ground on which the Committee declined to go into the question. If there had been any misunderstanding with regard to the Corporation of Leith, the Committee would go into it and see what was the best way in which justice could be done. As to the danger of losing the Bill, he would remind the House that this was a Bill which had come from the House of Lords, and that the Committee would only have this one question to consider; therefore he did not think there was any ground for the fear of the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) that there would be any delay in the passing of the Bill.

MR. WEBSTER said, that he would withdraw his Amendment in favour of the proposal of the Chairman of Ways and Means.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Motion made, and Question, "That the Bill be re-committed, in respect of Clause 36, to the former Committee,"—(*Sir Arthur Otway,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Leave to the Committee to sit and proceed forthwith.

SOUTHWARK AND VAUXHALL WATER BILL [*Lords*].

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, the Bill had already been discussed in the House, and a decision arrived at, not to dispense with the Standing Orders, which virtually amounted to the rejection of the second reading of the Bill. He, therefore, objected to the present Motion.

Second Reading *deferred* until *To-morrow.*

QUESTIONS.

—o—

LUNATIC ASYLUMS (IRELAND)—APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, How many medical men connected with the English lunatic asylums' service have been promoted during the past ten years to Irish asylums; what number of Irish asylum doctors have been promoted to English asylums; whether the asylums' service in Ireland, England, and Scotland are distinct from each other; are they differently governed; and are the qualifications of officers different; whether such an officer as a consulting and visiting physician exists in connection with the English and Scotch asylums; whether this officer has been removed from the English and Scotch asylums; if so, why has he been removed; what was the service of the two superintendents prior to their being taken from English asylums and appointed to the Castlebar District Asylum—namely, Dr. Conolly Norman, appointed in 1882 or 1883, and Dr. Finigan in 1885; what was the service of the then principal candidates for the Irish asylum service—namely, Dr. D. Exeter Jordan, of Castlebar, Dr. Taylor, of Dundrum, and Dr. Myles, of the Richmond Asylum, Dublin; what was the official position—and the pay attached to it—held by the medical men in England previously to their appointment by Lord Spencer to the important posts of superintendents of Irish asylums; and, why was Dr. Conolly Norman so quickly promoted to the Monaghan County Asylum from Castlebar?

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Sir William Hart Dyke): The object of these Questions appears to be to ascertain from me what reasons were in Lord Spencer's mind when he made certain appointments. It is obviously impossible for me to know this with certainty; but I have no objection to state what the facts are as disclosed by the Papers. Dr. Norman was for over six years an assistant at Monaghan Asylum; from there he came to the Bethlehem Asylum, London, and on the occurrence of a vacancy at Castlebar in 1882 was appointed to it by Lord Cowper. When the Monaghan Asylum became vacant this year Dr. Norman applied to be transferred, on the ground that he would have there increased facilities for pursuing his special studies in connection with lunacy, and Lord Spencer acceded to the request. The Governors of Castlebar Asylum bore very favourable testimony to Dr. Norman's qualifications, and his testimonials are of the highest character. He obtains no pecuniary benefit by the change. For the vacancy at Castlebar Lord Spencer selected Dr. Finigan, assistant at Northumberland Asylum. Dr. Finigan is an Irishman and a Roman Catholic, and has very good testimonials. Dr. Jordan, who is consulting physician at Castlebar, was a candidate for that asylum, and was, I believe, locally supported. He acted as *locum tenens* during the vacancy. Dr. Taylor has been assistant at Dundrum for nearly 10 years, and Dr. Myles at Richmond for about six years. I understand that it is not unusual to appoint outsiders to these posts. Except in cases of transfer, candidates are generally invited by public advertisement, the object being to secure the best man possible.

PUBLIC HEALTH (SCOTLAND) — INSANITARY CONDITION OF DUTHIL CHURCHYARD.

Mr. FRASER-MACKINTOSH asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether, with reference to the alleged insanitary state of the churchyard and mausoleum at Duthil, in the county of Inverness, regarding which an inquiry was ordered by the Home Office, it is true that Dr. Maclagan, of Edinburgh, the Reporter, made only one inspection, and that of so hurried a character that the horses of his conveyance did not require to be, and were not, unyoked; whether Dr. Maclagan declined to receive any evidence on the subject; and, whether, in the face of the rejoinder by the minister of the parish, dated 18th July current, to Dr. Maclagan's Report of the 6th July, reiterating and offering to establish his complaints of the insanitation, he will be pleased to order a new and independent inquiry, conducted by a competent person, who will be enjoined to take evidence on the spot, in usual form?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS), in reply, said, that after the first complaint the Board of Supervision called for a Report by the local medical officer, who certified that the complaint was groundless. In consequence of a renewed complaint the Board appointed Dr. Littlejohn as a Special Commissioner to inquire and report, who was clearly of opinion that the local medical officer's view was correct. In consequence of further complaints the then Secretary of State appointed Dr. Maclagan, Professor of Medical Jurisprudence in the University of Edinburgh, to make a special inquiry. He had sent in a very elaborate Report to the effect that the complaints made were groundless. The mode of conducting the examination was left entirely to him. The Secretary of State did not interfere. Under all these circumstances, he (Sir R. Assheton Cross) entirely declined to re-open the question.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—MR. GRAHAM, CLERK TO THE BOARD OF GUARDIANS, COOTEHILL UNION.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What decision the President of the Local Government Board has arrived at regarding the clerk of the Cootehill guardians?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): The hon. Member for Queen's County (Mr. Arthur O'Connor) has furnished me, in connection with this Question, with a very full statement of the charges alleged against Mr. Graham. That statement has been carefully examined, and is found to contain no matter which has not been already fully investigated. That being so, there are no grounds on which either I or the Local Government Board could properly re-open the case.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EXTRA POLICE AT GWEEDORE, CO. DONEGAL.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether there is now in the parish of Gweedore (county Donegal) an extra force of police, who chiefly employ themselves in the affairs of private persons by watching the salmon rivers; whether, on the 13th instant, the acting-serjeant of Barrack No. 2 arrested a boy of about fifteen named Dominick Sweeney, on the bank of the Gweedore River, and, when his mother came and remonstrated against the arrest, lacerated her wrist with a spear or gaff, tearing off the flesh to the wristbone; whether the acting-serjeant took the boy to the barrack, and kept him in custody all day and night, directing his father, who went to the barrack, to have bailsmen ready next morning to go before Mr. Olpherto, a magistrate, who lives ten miles away; whether the acting-serjeant, by interfering as he did in the daytime, exceeded the powers of constables, as laid down by 7 and 8 Vic. c. 108, s. 1; whether the arrest and detention of the boy Dominick Sweeney are contrary to 5 and 6 Vic. c. 106, s. 87; and, what action will be taken with reference to the arrest and the assault, and to provide that constables shall not act in excess of their legal powers in the interest of the owners and lessees of rivers?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): Owing to the disturbed state of the locality it has been found necessary to send four extra constables to Gweedore. They do not chiefly employ themselves in watching the salmon fishery; but it is, I find, part of their duty to prevent illegal fishing. On the 13th instant they arrested Dominick Sweeny for using a gaff and refusing to give his name. Sweeny's mother and another woman "remonstrated" by endeavouring to rescue the prisoner, and by stoning the police. In the struggle Mrs. Sweeny received a slight wound from the gaff which the sergeant had seized. Sweeny was brought in due time before the nearest magistrate and bailed to appear at Petty Sessions, where he was fined £5. I am advised that the action of the police was in accordance with the law.

ARMY—WIRE GUN CONSTRUCTION.

MR. GRAY asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether the Government are aware that the Longridge system of wire gun construction has formed the matter of scientific examination by Prussian artillery officers; whether Copies of their Report will be ordered to be printed for the use of Members of this House; and, whether it is the intention of the Government, in any experiments to be made in wire gun construction, to call in the aid of Mr. Longridge, the inventor, and thus insure a full test of the invention?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH): A lecture on Mr. Longridge's system of wire gun construction was delivered at Coblenz in January last by an officer of Prussian Artillery. It is presumed that this lecture is the Report to which the hon. Member refers. It is not considered that any useful purpose would be answered by presenting the document to Parliament. Mr. Longridge has, however, been recently invited to submit a gun constructed on his principle to the War Department.

MR. GRAY asked at whose expense was the gun to be submitted?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR: He will, of course, be asked to furnish a gun for examination by the Department.

FISHERIES (IRELAND)—THE RIVER SHANNON—THE LIMERICK BOARD OF CONSERVATORS.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been directed to the following letter, which appeared in last week's *Field*:—

> "Sir,—I am sure the angling readers of *The Field* in England as well as in Ireland will be astonished to hear the wretched plight to which our beautiful river has been brought by the Limerick Board of Conservators. To begin with, the Board itself is, as a body, broken up and defunct; the clerk (Mr. Alton), the inspector of water bailiffs and every water bailiff on the river from Haggs Head, down near the Atlantic, to Tarmonbarry, in Longford, have been dismissed for want of funds to pay them; the salmon and trout are in consequence left to take care of themselves; and the poachers are plying their vagabond trade wherever net, strokehaul, or gaff can be used with the most deadly effect. Where are the Irish Fishery Inspectors, and what action do they mean to take in the present great crisis.
>
> "S. J. Hurley.
>
> "Killaloe, July 13;"

Whether any steps have been taken by the Irish Fishery Inspectors to have the Shannon looked after in the estuary by the Coastguards, and in the middle and upper sections of the river by the Royal Irish Constabulary; whether the Government will prevent the Conservators from receiving, next October, the river funds for current season, which it is expected will amount to something like £2,500; and, whether the Inspectors of Fisheries will be instructed to see that the said moneys shall be judiciously expended in the preservation of the Shannon and its tributaries during the ensuing spawning season?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): The Inspectors inform me that immediately on learning that the bailiffs on the Shannon had been dismissed, they applied and received sanction for Coastguards and Constabulary to look after the enforcement of the law regarding the annual and weekly close seasons. I am also informed that there is no power in the Government to prevent the Conservators who may be elected in October next from receiving the river funds, and the law provides that the management of these funds shall be in the hands of the Conservators.

MR. SEXTON asked whether the Conservators generally failed to levy the 10 per cent on the valuation of the fisheries; and whether the right hon. Gentleman would make a full inquiry into the whole question?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND said, he was not aware of the circumstances mentioned.

THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—PENSIONERS.

MR. O'BRIEN (for Mr. HEALY) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Will he grant an inquiry into the claims of the few Constabulary pensioners in Ireland who received increased pay from 1872 till 1874, in compliance with the recommendations of the Commission which sat in 1872, but who were not granted the increased pensions also recommended by the said Commission; is he aware that several, if not all, of these men were discharged from their respective stations, and not brought before the Constabulary authorities in Dublin in the ordinary way; did men who were discharged a couple of weeks subsequently to the discharge of these men receive the increased pension; and, if no valid ground is found to exist for having deprived these men of the benefits they claim to be entitled to under the recommendations of the Commission of 1872, will the Government pay them the arrears of pension they think themselves justly entitled to?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): The claim of the Irish Constabulary pensioners who received increased pay from 1872 to 1874 to be allowed the benefit of a pension scheme which was not in force when they retired has been recently under the consideration of the Government, on a Memorial from some of their number; but we have seen no reason to alter the decision of successive Governments that the claim is quite untenable. The Inspector General informs me that in dealing with these cases there was no departure from the practice prevailing in the Force at the time.

INDIA — MADRAS PRESIDENCY — REVOLT OF TALOOKS.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether four talooks have recently been disarmed in the Madras Presidency; whether, since December last, there have been two encounters with the troops; whether dynamite has been freely used by the troops; whether one European soldier has been killed, and one officer and several soldiers wounded; and, whether twenty-four insurgents have been killed and none wounded.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL) in reply, said, three talooks had been disarmed since last December. Two encounters had taken place with the troops, in the course of which one officer had been killed and four European soldiers wounded. Dynamite had been used by the troops in order to effect an entrance into a building held by the insurgents. This subject could not be dealt with in the space of an answer, and if the hon. Member moved for Papers they would be presented.

LAW AND POLICE—THE "PALL MALL GAZETTE"—PUBLICATION OF OFFENSIVE ARTICLES.

MR. P. A. MUNTZ asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he has taken the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown as to whether a publication called *The Pall Mall Gazette* has been guilty of a violation of the Law by publishing the obscene matter which has recently appeared in its columns; and, if their opinion is that an offence has been committed, why the Government have not instituted a prosecution against that journal?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): On the 14th of July I stated that, after consultation with the highest legal advice at their disposal, the Government had come to the conclusion that it would not be desirable to take proceedings against the editor of the paper named. I have never swerved from that conclusion, and the matter remains as before.

ARMY EDUCATION—THE STAFF COLLEGE—ORIENTAL LANGUAGES.

COLONEL MILNE-HOME asked the Secretary of State for War, If, in accordance with a promise made by the late Secretary of State for War to the House on March 19th, 1885, the question of affording officers at the Staff College opportunities of studying modern Oriental languages has been considered; and what, if any, decision has been arrived at?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH): The question has been considered; but the course at the Staff College is so largely taken up in military studies that it is not thought advisable to introduce in any special manner the study of Oriental languages. Steps have, however, been taken for the formation of classes at Cairo and Alexandria for the study of Arabic, and rewards will be given to successful students by way of encouraging the acquisition of a knowledge of that language. I may add that, after much discussion, a scheme has been elaborated under which the Civil Service Commissioners will hold half-yearly examinations in any languages, including Oriental languages, for which officers may present themselves. There will be two degrees of qualification—one, the simple pass, the other a certificate for an interpretership.

FISHERY LAWS (IRELAND) — THE RIVER SUIR—CASE OF O'SHEA AND OTHERS.

MR. R. POWER (for Mr. LEAMY) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is the fact that the Lord Lieutenant lately refused to remit or reduce the fines imposed on a man named O'Shea and others for an offence against the Fishery Laws in the River Suir, although the magistrates who tried the case and the Commissioners of Fisheries recommended the remission of the fines, on the ground of the good characters and the poverty of the persons fined; and, if the Lord Lieutenant consulted the Inspectors of the Fisheries on the matter; if not, will he consult them, and will he reconsider the Memorial praying for a remission of the fines?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): O'Shea and three other men were fined £3 collectively for an offence against the Fishery Laws. They appealed to the Lord Lieutenant, and His Excellency consulted the Fishery Inspectors, who recommended that the penalty should not be reduced. The fine having been paid and allocated, His Excellency has no power to make any order in the matter.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE EARL OF BELFAST, CLERK OF THE PEACE, CO. ANTRIM.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Earl of Belfast holds, and has held for about 36 years, the office of clerk of the peace for the county of Antrim; whether he draws from this office, in salary and fees, about £1,600 per annum; whether the duties of the office are wholly performed by a deputy at Belfast; whether the clerk, the Earl of Belfast, lives in London, has no Irish address, and has not resided in the county Antrim, or in any part of Ireland, at any time for the past thirty years; whether the clerk is entitled to continue to hold his office, and draw his salary, without performing any of the duties, and without even attaching his signature to decrees of the county court judge, notices for Parliamentary registration, lists of voters, and other documents by law required to be signed by the clerk of the peace; and, how he acquired the office, what is his tenure of it, and whether the Government will take the needful steps to substitute for him a competent person residing in the county?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): I believe the hon. Member had given Notice of this Question before my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland made a statement in Committee of Supply on the subject to which it refers. That statement was very full and explicit, and gave all the information that can be procured in answer to the Question. The hon. Member will, therefore, I am sure, not expect me to add anything to it.

EGYPT—THE SOUDAN—THE SUAKIN-BERBER RAILWAY.

SIR HENRY TYLER asked the Secretary of State for War, What is the existing condition of the Railway from Suakin towards Berber; what length of line has been constructed; whether it is now guarded or maintained; and what portion is still available for traffic; and, what quantities of tons of rails and what number of sleepers were purchased or provided; what numbers were despatched from this Country or elsewhere to Suakin; what proportion of those were landed at Suakin, and are still there; what proportion have been sent away from Suakin; to what destination; and where they now are?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH): No recent Report has been received on the condition of this line; but it is known that a portion has been damaged by heavy rains, and it is reported that another portion has been torn up by the Arabs. The total length constructed was 18¾ miles. This is not guarded or maintained beyond the west redoubt, about a mile and a-half from the landing place. 15,000 tons of rails and 375,000 sleepers were provided, of which all the rails and 345,000 sleepers were despatched to Suakin. Of the materials sent out, about one-sixth were landed at Suakin, and are still there. The remainder were brought back to England, and will probably be made use of at certain military stations where tramways are required.

ROADS AND BRIDGES (IRELAND)—THE TOUR SLATE QUARRIES—BRIDGE OVER THE RIVER SUIR.

Mr. MARUM asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether his attention has been directed to the collapse of the workings of the Tour Slate Quarries, as described by Mr. P. Morrissy, of Carrick on Suir, in *The Munster Express*, as follows:—

> "Some few years ago a gentleman, a native of Wales, bought the interest in a plot of land from Count de la Poer, situated on that part of his property called Tour, within two miles from Kilsheelan, and five from Carrick on Suir. His object was to open a slate quarry, which his long experience as engineer and manager of several works of this kind both in Europe and America enabled him to foresee that it should be a decided success. He imported machinery and implements at great cost and inconvenience, engaged twenty-five men at from 12*s.* to 18*s.* per week, and for two or three months the good work went on, every day adding more and more to the enthusiasm of the spirited explorer. A stream runs close by the quarry, which, in order to admit cars to the bye-road leading to the public thoroughfare between Clonmel and Carrick on Suir, it would be necessary to build a bridge over. When the necessity arose, Mr. Thomas Williams, the proprietor of the works, went to the Count de la Poer for advice and co-operation, and was curtly informed that he would neither allow the bridge to be constructed nor the road to be used. All machinery, implements, &c. were packed into the dwelling-house, where they still remain;"

and, whether the Government will advise the Board of Public Works in Ireland to send one of the Land Improvement Inspectors to this slate quarry of Tour, to make a report thereon, in order to place an authoritative statement before Count de la Poer, so as to induce him to reconsider his determination, and, further, to lay grounds for an application before the forthcoming Presentment Sessions to construct a bridge on the spot desired?

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Sir William Hart Dyke): Time has not admitted of my ascertaining the facts of this case; but it appears to be a matter of private undertaking over which the Government has no control.

ARMY—FATAL ACCIDENT AT CATERHAM RANGES.

Dr. FARQUHARSON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been drawn to a fatal accident which occurred recently to a recruit of the Guards at the Caterham ranges when at skirmish drill with fixed bayonets; and, whether he will consult the Military authorities as to the necessity of soldiers going through such dangerous practice?

The SECRETARY of STATE for WAR (Mr. W. H. Smith): The occurrence referred to was an accident of a most unusual character, and it may be hoped is very unlikely to occur again. It is essential that recruits at certain stages of their training should practice with fixed bayonets, in order to acquire skill and steadiness in the use of their arms. As a rule, the knowledge that bayonets are fixed makes the men very careful. The Military Authorities do not consider that any change in the Regulations is required.

POST OFFICE—PRE-PAYMENT OF POSTAGE.

Sir JOHN KENNAWAY asked the Postmaster General, If he will extend to post offices of towns, being the places of election and head quarters of new Parliamentary divisions, the privilege now afforded to a few large towns of posting letters unstamped but prepaid in cash where the aggregate postage of such letters is not less than five pounds?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord John Manners): I regret that I am unable to accede to the hon. Member's proposal. The abolition many years ago of permissive pre-payment in money has been attended with great advantage; and although, in the case of a few large towns, the rule has been relaxed, further relaxation is very undesirable. It has been considered whether it would be practicable to make arrangements, specially for the days of the approaching elections; but this is found not to be possible.

SOUTH AFRICA—BASUTOLAND.

Sir ROBERT FOWLER (Lord Mayor) asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he has received any recent communication from Colonel Clarke on the state of affairs in Basutoland; and, if so, will he inform the House of their purport?

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Colonel Stanley): Our last general Report from Colonel Clarke is dated April 22. I fear it would be impossible to state within the limits of an answer the substance of the Correspondence which has taken place with Her Majesty's Representative in Basutoland; but the Papers will be presented to Parliament, and my right hon. Friend will see that tranquillity in Basutoland has been fairly well preserved. I am now glad that my right hon. Friend postponed his Question until to-day, for it so happens that in a telegram, principally on other matters, I have this day heard from the Cape that Masupha has sent in some hut tax, and that things in Basutoland are looking rather better.

SIR ROBERT FOWLER (LORD MAYOR): Will Papers be presented before the close of the Session?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES: I will make inquiry; but I am afraid not.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—APPOINTMENT OF MEDICAL OFFICERS.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Is it the usual course to appoint the medical officer of a dispensary district as medical adviser to the Police; and, is it the intention of the Inspector General of Police in Ireland to separate the appointments in the case of Castlepollard and Coole districts?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): There is no rule on the subject; but it often happens that the dispensary doctor is the most suitable candidate for appointment as medical officer to the Constabulary, and when this is so he is appointed. The Inspector General cannot decide what course to adopt in the case of Castlepollard and Coole districts, as no appointment has yet been made to the dispensaries there.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) BILL.

MR. FINDLATER asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Upon what day he proposes to take the Second Reading of the Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill; and, whether on the Second Reading the Government will be prepared to communicate to the House the names of the two Commissioners proposed to be appointed?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): The Bill is down for second reading on Friday next. I cannot give any such undertaking as that suggested in the second paragraph of this Question. On the contrary, I do not think an announcement of the kind should be made until a much later stage of the Bill has been reached than the second reading.

INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND)—EXAMINATIONS.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Why the examination papers for the Irish Intermediate Examinations, which in every previous year had been printed in Dublin, were printed this year in London; and, whether the former practice will be resumed?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): I am informed that the Board of Intermediate Education consider it a matter of extreme importance that the place where their examination papers are printed should not be disclosed.

BOARD OF NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—EXTRA INSTRUCTION.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the officers of the Irish Board of National Education have lately made an order that extra instruction by teachers to monitors "must be given in the schoolroom," although there is no direction to this effect in the rules and regulations of the Board; and, whether, as teachers had always been allowed to give extra instruction, at their residences, to the monitors of their schools, and the new direction makes it necessary, in many cases, to walk long distances in bad weather, and imposes much hardship, especially on old and infirm teachers, the Commissioners will direct that the extra instruction may be given, as heretofore, at the residences of the teachers?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): There is no rule on this subject; but it is a recognized principle of the National Board, and one from which departures are only allowed in cases of a peculiar and exceptional character, that every service for which salary, gratuity, or results fees are claimable, including the extra instruction of monitors, must be discharged in the school room. As the proper time for giving this extra instruction is immediately before or after the ordinary school hours, no question of extra walking is involved.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS — REGISTRATION OF VOTERS BILL—PRINTING OF THE VOTING LISTS, CO. ARMAGH.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Is it a fact that the printing of the supplemental lists of voters for the county of Armagh was entrusted by the Clerk of the Crown and Peace to two Orange printers, and that the information disclosed by these lists was in the hands of the Conservative agents before the date of their regular publication; is it true that, at the recent sitting of the Armagh Grand Jury, no contract was entered into for the printing of the county register, and supplemental and other lists; if so, by what authority the Clerk of the Crown and Peace entrusted the work to the two persons referred to; and, if the contract was illegal, will payment be disallowed when settling the amount of the contribution to be made out of the Imperial Exchequer to the Grand Jury in respect of the expenses of registration?

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Sir William Hart Dyke): I am informed, with regard to the first paragraph of the Question, that it is not the fact as stated therein. In North and Mid Armagh the work was given to the ordinary printers for the Grand Jury, and in South Armagh to the office of a strictly non-political paper. The Statutes which rendered the printing necessary had not become law in time to enable the contracts to be brought before the last Presentment Sessions and Grand Jury; but the expenses incurred will still come under review, and any cesspayer will have an opportunity of objecting.

DEFENCES OF THE EMPIRE—DEFENCE OF THE SEAPORTS.

Captain PRICE asked Mr. Attorney General, If his attention has been called to the proposed scheme for the defence of our seaports by private enterprise; and, whether he has considered how far the use of armed private ships or torpedo vessels, manned by officers and men not members of the Royal Navy, nor under its Articles of War, would be in accordance with International Law?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, he was not quite sure that he had seen the scheme referred to; but as to whether the use of armed private ships and torpedo vessels would be in accordance with International Law would depend on the service on which such ships and vessels were engaged, and the regulations under which they were acting. In the absence of more detailed information on those points, he could not give any further answer.

Sir JOHN HAY: Would it not depend upon whether the officers were duly commissioned?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL: Upon that and many other circumstances.

PUBLIC WORKS—THE MAIL JETTY AT HOLYHEAD.

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he is prepared to sanction the expenditure necessary to render the Mail Jetty at Holyhead safe and commodious for the arrival and departure of the Mail Steamers from and to Ireland?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Sir Henry Holland) (who replied) said: The Mail Packet Company have for some time been in correspondence with the Treasury and Board of Trade with reference to this subject; and special Reports on it were accordingly obtained from Sir John Hawkshaw and from the Harbour Master at Holyhead, Admiral Mackenzie. Both these experienced authorities concur in saying that the present works, subject to some repairs which will be carried out in due course, afford reasonable security to the mail packets; and the Government would, therefore, not be justified in proposing to Parliament any further expenditure on the jetty beyond what is required by the terms of the mail contract.

REGISTRY OF DEEDS OFFICE, DUBLIN.

Colonel KING-HARMAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he can explain why the Commission appointed last year to inquire into the grievances of the clerks in the Registry of Deeds Office, Ireland, have made no Report; and if he is aware that there are now three vacancies in that office which have not been filled up; and, whether he will call upon the Commissioners to send in their Report without further delay?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (who replied) said: The Committee to which my hon. and gallant Friend alludes was appointed in December last, but, owing to the illness of one Member, was only able to commence its work in March, and, owing to the professional engagements of some Members of it, has not yet been in a condition to report. The Report will, however, be made as soon as practicable. In the meanwhile, the vacancies in the upper parts of the office will be filled up by promotions from the staff.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE COURT OF BANKRUPTCY, DUBLIN.

MR. FINDLATER asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, If he has seen the observations of the Honourable Judge Miller, reported in the Dublin newspapers, in reference to the answer given by him to the question asked on the 17th instant with regard to the refusal of the Treasury to fill up the vacancy in the office staff; can he explain the alleged inaccuracies contained in his answer, viz. that the work of the office had decreased about forty per cent. since the staff was last fixed by the Treasury, and that the Treasury had only insisted on the very moderate reduction of two clerks in a staff of fourteen, when, in point of fact, there are only one chief clerk, two clerks, and a deputy assistant registrar discharging the duties of the general office of the Court; and, will the Financial Secretary state his authority for the statements in his answer, and if the information on which such statements were founded was derived from any source sufficiently reliable to justify the Treasury in refusing the clerical assistance solemnly declared by the Judge to be required for the efficient transaction of the business of the Court?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND): I have seen a report of Judge Miller's remarks in reference to the answer I formerly gave. My statement about the reduction in business was taken from the "Judicial Statistics," and the further statement with regard to the staff referred to the total establishment of the Court, including permanent copyists. My information on other points is derived from two experienced officers, who visited the Department last year, investigated the amount and nature of the work done there, and ascertained the personal opinions of the staff upon the subject.

TURKEY (EUROPEAN PROVINCES)—AFFAIRS OF MACEDONIA.

MR. BRYCE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, When it is intended to present to the House the Report on the condition of Macedonia, made by Major Trotter after his visit last winter, and which has been received by the Foreign Office some months ago?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BOURKE): Yes, Sir; this Report will be laid on the Table, probably before the end of the Session.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRIES.

MR. ATKINSON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is true, as stated in yesterday's *Times*, that Sir T. H. Farrer has been invited to accept nomination as a member of the Royal Commission on Depression of Trade, he having published a pamphlet on that subject, and his opinions therefore being already well known?

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD: I wish to ask whether it is true, as reported, that two right hon. Gentlemen and two hon. Members of this House have declined to serve on this Commission?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH): It is not true that Sir Thomas Farrer has been invited to accept nomination as a Member of this Commission. As regards the Question of the hon. Member for Salford, I scarcely think it would be well to make a statement on the subject.

THE METROPOLITAN POLICE.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he is aware that, at a meeting held at the Memorial

Hall, Farringdon Street, on the 22nd inst., and reported in *The Pall Mall Gazette* of the 23rd inst., Mr. Benjamin Scott, described as the Chamberlain of the City of London, in a public speech, accused the superior officials of the Metropolitan Police Force of collusion with notorious law-breakers, and, after stating that the Right hon. Member for Derby in his administration of the office of Home Secretary had not done his duty either as a gentleman or a statesman, proceeded to specify instances of gross mismanagement of the Metropolitan Police Force, and to assert that the Metropolitan Police were corrupted by bribes given to them by publicans and prostitutes; whether there is any foundation for the serious charges which have been thus made by Mr. Scott against the Right hon. Member for Derby, and against the Metropolitan Police; and, whether he will consider whether any, and what, proceedings should be taken in respect of either accusation?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): With reference to that part of the Question which applies to the right hon. Gentleman opposite, I must decline to answer it. I cannot endorse the statement of the Chamberlain; but the right hon. Gentleman is here to answer the charges for himself if any farther answer is required. With regard to the police in general, I must say that any vague and general accusations are, to my mind, most unfair; and I can only say that if anyone will send specific information on any point strict inquiry will be made. The police authorities are most anxious that every such accusation should be thoroughly investigated.

CYPRUS (FINANCE, &c.)—LANDING DUTIES.

VISCOUNT NEWPORT asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether it is the case that Officers on active service have to pay a heavy duty on their personal effects when landing at Cyprus; and, if so, whether some distinction could be drawn in this respect between Officers in Her Majesty's Service and other individuals?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel STANLEY), in reply, said, that officers on landing at Cyprus had to pay a heavy duty on their personal effects. He had telegraphed to the High Commissioner of Cyprus to ask if some arrangement could be made in the direction indicated. He had received a reply that day; but he was sorry to say that it would necessitate further communication, and, therefore, he could not give any further information. He would do all that lay in his power to see the matter adjusted.

EGYPT—THE SOUDAN—THE GARRISON OF KASSALA.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the report in *The Standard*, dated Cairo, July 21, with regard to Kassala, is correct—

> "Captain Chermside telegraphs that the rebels, in great force, attacked the suburbs of Kassala on June 15 and 16.
>
> "After severe fighting, they were repulsed by the garrison, who killed 3,000 of the rebels, and captured 1,000 oxen, 1,000 sheep, and 700 rifles.
>
> "It is understood here that the British Government is in hopes of an arrangement being made with King John of Abyssinia for the relief of the Kassala garrison by Ras Aloula, the Abyssinian General."

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BOURKE): We have received intelligence of a severe defeat of the besiegers by the garrison of Kassala; but the details in the newspaper quoted are not contained in the official Report. I do not think it would be expedient at present to announce what steps Her Majesty's Government are taking with a view to the safe withdrawal of the garrison from Kassala.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT: I wish to know whether Her Majesty's Government are taking some steps for the relief of Kassala?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS: Yes, Sir.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: Can the right hon. Gentleman state the name of the Commander in charge of this magnificent defence?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS: At this moment I do not think I can give the Commander's name; but I will make inquiry.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Do we understand the right hon. Gentleman to state that steps are being taken to relieve the garrison of Kassala, and are we to understand that this will involve any expenditure? In that case are we to hope that a Supplementary Estimate will be laid on the Table for this expenditure which the House will be asked to grant, so that we shall have an opportunity of discussing it?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS: If the hon. Gentleman puts the Question on Thursday I shall be able to give him an answer.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES —SITES OF THE METROPOLITAN PRISONS.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, with a view to the discussion of the Bill for the better Housing of the Working Classes, he will have a valuation made by the Consulting Surveyor of the Office of Works of the sites of Millbank and Pentonville Prisons?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) said, this matter did not belong to the Office of Works, therefore he could not tell how far it might come within the scope of the ordinary duty of the Surveyor. As to whether it would be well that a special valuation should be made, that was another matter; and if the right hon. Gentleman would communicate with the right hon. Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke), who had charge of the Bill, he would be ready to pay the greatest attention to any suggestion which might fall from the right hon. Gentleman.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he had always understood that the Surveyor of the Office of Works was bound to undertake any duty relating to Government property.

MR. COURTNEY inquired whether, although the Bill was to be in the hands of the right hon. Member for Chelsea, it would have precedence as a Government measure; and if so, when might they expect it to be brought up?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Yes, Sir; of course we will give it precedence, but I cannot say when it will be brought on.

EGYPT—MISSION OF SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked, Whether the Government intended to propose any Supplementary Vote in connection with the Mission of the right hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff), and whether the House would have an opportunity of discussing the matter?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH): I have already stated to the House that we did not think it would be necessary to present a Supplementary Estimate for the expenses of the Mission of my right hon. Friend; but if there was any general desire on the part of the House to discuss the policy of that Mission ,an opportunity would be afforded for the discussion. I am to be asked a Question on the subject to-morrow.

HIGH COMMISSIONER OF NEW GUINEA.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked, Whether there was to be any Vote proposed for the High Commissioner of New Guinea?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH), in reply, said, he was afraid that there could be no Vote for the High Commissioner of New Guinea, because negotiations with the Colonies were still proceeding, and they did not know what expenses would be required.

PARLIAMENT—PUBLIC BUSINESS.

In reply to Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE,

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) said: We propose to finish Supply, and then take as the next Business the Telegraphs Bill and next the Criminal Law Amendment Bill, until the Committee on the Bill is finished.

MR. LEWIS: I beg to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether it is still understood that the Vote for the Queen's Colleges will be the first Order to-morrow?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Yes, Sir.

DEPRESSION OF TRADE (IRELAND)—A ROYAL COMMISSION.

MR. SEXTON: I wish to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer a Question, of which I have given Notice on Friday last, but, if convenient, I will put it down for to-morrow. It is, Whether the Government will recommend the appointment of a Royal Commission to pursue in Ireland the inquiry conducted this Session by a Select Committee of this House into the subject of Irish industries? I would also ask the right hon. Gentleman whether there is any intention to proceed to-night with either the Labourers (Ireland) Bill, or with the consideration of the Lords' Amendments to the Poor Law Guardians Bill?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH): I believe, Sir, it is the intention of my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary to proceed with the Labourers Bill, if possible, to-night. With regard to the other matter, of course the subject of Irish industries will be included in the inquiry of the Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade; but it is not proposed to appoint a special Commission.

MR. SEXTON said, that as there were special circumstances in Irish depression quite distinct from those of England and Scotland, he and his Friends would endeavour to obtain a separate Inquiry.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

SUPPLY—ARMY ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £3,298,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Provisions, Forage, Fuel, Transport and other Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886."

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he had placed a Notice on the Paper for the reduction of the Vote by £360,000 on account of Bechuanaland. That would raise the whole question of the policy which had been pursued by Her Majesty's Government in South Africa, and he moved the reduction of the Vote in order to elicit some information from the Government upon the subject. He was afraid that a Motion to reduce the Vote would not have much practical effect, nor was there much use in criticizing it, because he had every reason to believe that the money had been spent, and he was almost afraid that something more had been spent besides. But that was just what he wanted to know—namely, what really had been spent? He understood that payment would be required for recruiting, which had been going on very largely in connection with South Africa; and they had been officially informed by Sir Hercules Robinson that expenses now going on in connection with Bechuanaland amounted to £120,000 a-month, or something like £1,500,000 per annum. He was afraid, therefore, that notwithstanding all the money which had been already voted, much more would be spent. But what he wanted distinctly to know was, whether the sum of £500,000 voted for a Military Expedition to Bechuanaland had been spent; and if more would be required, where was the money to come from, for he did not find that there was any additional Vote on the subject? He should be glad if the Colonial Secretary or the Secretary of State for War would inform him whether Her Majesty's Government considered themselves free to apply any portion of the Vote of Credit of £11,000,000, voted a short time ago by the House, which might not have been spent in war preparations in connection with Egypt or with the Indian Frontier, to the South African Expedition; or whether the money required for military services in Bechuanaland would come from some other source? He had also a strong desire to know whether Her Majesty's Government were able to form any opinion as to what would be the future expense incurred by this country in regard to Bechuanaland? He found that the Estimates for that expenditure varied from £1,500,000 per annum, which was the rate of expenditure going on now, according to Sir Hercules Robinson, to £60,000, which was the minimum expenditure given by Sir Charles Warren in his Estimate. He (Sir George Campbell) was not inclined to believe that the actual expenditure would be, in any case, as low as £60,000 per annum, seeing that they had 4,000 of Her Majesty's troops out there, and looking also at the passions which had been stirred up in South Africa by the proceedings of Sir Charles Warren. He was afraid that when they found it convenient to withdraw their troops from Bechuanaland, they would find that the expenses had been much more than £60,000 per annum; and the principal expenditure arose from military preparations. He should be glad to know, in general terms, what the policy of Her Majesty's Government in regard to Bechuanaland was, as the information now in possession of the House was extremely deficient. The late Government told them nothing whatever, but left them in a state of doubt; and the present Government, being merely a temporary Government, it became very difficult for them to decide upon the question of permanent expenditure. ["Oh!"] The Government might have a majority in the other House; but at the present moment they certainly did not possess a majority in the House of Commons. He hoped the Government would be able to tell the Committee, in general terms, what their policy in South Africa was, and what they proposed to do in regard to that country. He believed it was universally admitted by all who had discussed the question that the one noticeable fact in connection with South Africa was the absolute uncertainty of the policy likely to be pursued. One thing was done one day, and another the next, and the whole of their policy had been one of continual oscillation without any fixed plan whatever. Some time ago, by the Sand River Convention, there was a distinct policy set forth, and it was decided that the British power should not be carried beyond a fixed limit; but now they had gone beyond that limit, and had committed themselves to indefinite liabilities. As soon as they passed the territory of one Native Chief, they seemed to come into contact with another Native Chief; and all they did was to involve themselves in indefinite responsibilities. He wanted to know whether they were to go forward, to remain stationary, or to go backward? A great deal would depend upon the decision at which Her Majesty's Government might arrive upon the questions at issue between Sir Charles Warren and Sir Hercules Robinson. Speaking as one who had had considerable experience in administration, and having looked carefully over the Papers in order to ascertain whether Sir Charles Warren was right or wrong, he had come to the conclusion that his conduct had been such as to show that he was a most unfit man to be intrusted with the interests of the British Empire in that country. However able and dashing a man he might be, he had shown an extreme want of discretion in several matters; and in saying that, he (Sir George Campbell) judged of him by his own words, and by the contradictions which had taken place in his policy. At one time Sir Charles Warren appeared to be of one way of thinking, while at another time his views were entirely the reverse. He had now, under cover of military rule, established a partizan Government in Bechuanaland and Stellaland. He had taken one side of the question only, and had not allowed himself to see the other side at all. He began by accepting the position Her Majesty's Government assigned to him, which placed him in subordination to the High Commissioner, and he commenced his Mission by accepting the policy of the High Commissioner. It was not long, however, before he completely turned round; and since then he had absolutely defied the authority of his superior—the High Commissioner of South Africa. That being the effect of the proceedings of Sir Charles Warren, he could not help thinking that the Papers laid upon the Table showed an extreme want of discretion on the part of that officer. He had asserted his authority in South Africa with a very high hand, as was shown by the transactions which had occurred in regard to the death of a man who lost his life in South Africa some years previously, and the circumstances attending which were perfectly well known. It was a political offence which occurred some years ago, and the action of Sir Charles Warren in connection with it had been most indiscreet. It had been found necessary to abandon it; but the proceedings of Sir Charles Warren had left a great deal of bad blood behind. Altogether, it was a most injudicious proceeding on the part of that officer. Then, again, in establishing military rule in Bechuanaland and Stellaland, and under that military rule electing an Assembly, in which one side only was allowed to vote, while the other was excluded altogether, Sir Charles Warren was guilty of a most improper proceeding. He would not weary the Committee by going into details upon all of those matters, because they were already written at great length in the Blue

Book; but it did seem to him that, in the main, it was fully proved that Sir Charles Warren had taken up the position of a most indiscreet partizan; that he had stirred up a great amount of hatred against his rule; and that a great deal of difficulty must follow from the course he had pursued. He should have thought that Her Majesty's Government would have had sufficient warning in regard to the administration of a Military Commissioner from the example afforded by the action of Sir Owen Lanyon in the Transvaal, and that they would have been slow to commit themselves to the acts of another military officer who displayed strong partizanship and extreme want of discretion. At that moment the extreme irritation expressed by the whole of the Dutch population of South Africa in consequence of the steps which had been taken was very great; nor was it confined to the Transvaal and Bechuanaland, but was extended all over South Africa. He hoped that some explanation would be given of the differences which had arisen between Sir Hercules Robinson and Sir Charles Warren in regard to Native Dominion in South Africa, and the course which this country intended to pursue in that matter. So far as Native Dominion in South Africa was concerned, he was, as a rule, averse to the extension of this great Empire. At the same time, if their rule was to be extended anywhere—and it had been enormously extended in various parts of the world—his impression was that they owed considerable obligations to South Africa on account of the expectations they had held out to the people of that country, and the difficulty of administering Native territory through the hands of the Colonial authorities. He had always been inclined to think that there was a great deal to be said in favour of establishing a Native Dominion over a considerable part of South Africa. But he thought they ought to be consistent in the matter, and ought to have some settled policy, and not allow themselves to be driven about from one extreme to another. He objected especially to the policy of allowing the Colonies to take all the Possessions that were profitable, and turning them over to them when they became unprofitable. They had experienced many difficulties of that kind in connection with Basutoland and Zululand. With regard to the territory in Bechuanaland, he was of opinion that their policy had shown almost every stage of inconsistency. The first arrangement after the Transvaal War was that they should take over a part of the Native territory; but they left the Boers the whole of what was nominally Transvaal territory. They said—"We will not go beyond that line; but, at the same time, we will protect the Natives." Yet it would now appear that they were in a curious state of transformation, and were in reality going beyond Transvaal territory. Nor were they confining the Transvaal Government to their own Possessions. He certainly did not understand why they should allow the Boers to go beyond their own territory, and take the better part of Zululand, while, at the same time, they took up a high position and declared that they would not allow the Boers to invade Bechuanaland at all. It was most extraordinary why we should allow the Boers to invade territory to which we had easy access, and yet undertake the responsibility of defending Bechuanaland, which was very remote from the sea and from our base of operations, and very difficult to get at. His own idea was that it would have been better to have taken possession of the Eastern Coast, including Zululand, and they might have established a considerable Dominion in that part of the world. He objected to the limit of their annexation of Bechuanaland, because it was entirely artificial. It was a country as large as Spain—as large or larger than any European country except Russia. But the limit which had been fixed of the 22nd degree of South latitude was entirely an artificial limit; and it would be almost impossible to confine themselves to it, or to any other line, because the territory would constantly grow as the demands upon them increased, and it would be altogether impossible to confine themselves to the 22nd degree of South latitude. Their operations would have to be extended far beyond. As he had pointed out, Bechuanaland was entirely cut off from the sea. The annexation had been justified on the ground that it was necessary to preserve the great trade route through that territory. He was inclined to believe, however, that that great trade route was simply an invention by some clever fellow, and that it had been fabricated, not by any amount of trade upon it, but for the express purpose of justifying the annexation. The country beyond was nearer to the Indian Ocean, on the one side, and to the Atlantic, on the other, than to Cape Town, and he did not see what interest it could be to us to draw trade there. He very much doubted the propriety of the decision to take possession of Bechuanaland, or the reality of the agitation which had been got up in regard to it. But all he expected Her Majesty's Government to do now was to tell the Committee, in general terms, what they proposed to do in reference to the events of the last three months. Did they propose to maintain military possession of the whole territory up to the 22nd degree of South latitude, or did they at any time propose to occupy territory beyond which would bring them in contact with the Native Chiefs? Did they intend to stop at any particular point? He knew that that had been done very much in the hope of getting Cape Colony to take over the territory; but he very much doubted whether the Cape authorities would do anything of the kind. Nor did he believe in the propriety of handing over additional territory to the Colonial authorities there. They had quite enough to do to manage that which they already possessed. And he doubted very much the policy of calling upon this country to pay heavy sums for the purpose of establishing a great Dominion in that part of South Africa. He wanted to know, if this country was to be occupied, how the funds for military occupation and civil government were to be provided? If the idea was to settle the country, no doubt it was desirable that that should be done. It might be most desirable, if it were possible, to settle steady agricultural British Colonists; but he did not believe that they would be able to compete with the Dutch. For real hard-working qualities the Dutch settler was, as a rule, very much superior to what was well known in South Africa—the loafing British speculator. If he could see any prospect of British Colonization in that country, he should be delighted to see it carried out; but he knew that, of all the countries in the world, land jobbing was carried on in a very extravagant style, much more so than farming. Therefore, he very much doubted whether there was any prospect of real and genuine British colonization being effected. However, he would conclude his remarks, as he began, by admitting that Her Majesty's Government were placed in an extremely difficult position, and probably it might be impossible for them to bind this country definitely to any permanent policy in the matter. All he now wanted was that they should tell the Committee, in the best way they could, what they proposed to do in regard to South Africa during the next six months, and where they proposed to get the money to carry on their policy. He would move the reduction of the Vote by the amount of the war expenditure in Bechuanaland, in order to elicit an explanation on the subject from the Government; and if, upon the general question, Her Majesty's Government could not give a definite decision and explanation, he at least hoped they would tell the Committee how they intended to decide the matters at issue between Sir Hercules Robinson and Sir Charles Warren. He had expressed a strong opinion that Sir Charles Warren was not the man to maintain British authority in South Africa. On the other hand, Sir Hercules Robinson was a very experienced administrator; a safe, steady, reliable man, in whose hands the interests of this country were pretty safe. With all deference to the views of Her Majesty's Government, he firmly believed that if they intended to persist in Sir Charles Warren remaining in South Africa, and suffered the authority of Sir Hercules Robinson to be set at defiance, nothing of a prudent or satisfactory character would be done. On the other hand, he asked the Government not to listen to one side of the question only—to declarations of views which were falsely called the public opinion of this country, but which were really the result of the agitation of a few newspapers, which had not only placed Sir Hercules Robinson in a false position, but would tend to absolve him from all future responsibility should unforeseen liabilities be incurred by this country. All this would inevitably place the British taxpayer in a more difficult and anomalous position than he (Sir George Campbell), for one, was prepared to face. He begged to move the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £360,000.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £3,038,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for Provisions, Forage, Fuel, Transport and other Services, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886."—(*Sir George Campbell.*)

SIR ROBERT FOWLER (LORD MAYOR) said, he had been very glad to hear some of the remarks which had fallen from his hon. Friend in reference to the territories in South Africa. He understood that, at last, although his hon. Friend was opposed to the annexation of some parts of South Africa, he had arrived at the conclusion that it was necessary for the interests of this country to take possession of Zululand. He had been glad to hear that remark from his hon. Friend. He thought they must all feel that the time had come when it was the duty of the Government to take some action with regard to that unfortunate country. The country had been placed in its present difficult position owing to incessant changes of policy and the course pursued by Her Majesty's Government, for which he thought both sides of the House were jointly responsible. In the first place, when his right hon. Friends were in Office last they overthrew the power of Cetewayo. The result of that proceeding had been most unfortunate. Had it not been for the overthrow of the power of Cetewayo he believed that the Transvaal would not have been in the position it now occupied, and that their policy in South Africa would not have had such disastrous effects. That was the result of the policy of the Government of the Earl of Beaconsfield. When the Government of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone) acceded to Office they restored Cetewayo. He was not prepared to find fault with that policy, as he, unfortunately, recommended it at the time; but it proved, in the end, to be an entire failure, and, in his humble opinion, they were altogether responsible for the state of anarchy in which the country had been left in consequence. The result of their interference in the affairs of Zululand had been that one Government overthrew Cetewayo; another Government tried to restore him; they had failed to support him, and nothing but anarchy had prevailed ever since. It was now found that the Boers from the Transvaal were attempting to occupy the country, and the time had arrived when the Government of this country ought to make themselves fully responsible for the government of Zululand. As far as he could see, there was only one course to be pursued, and that was to annex the country. He had arrived at that conclusion reluctantly, because he knew there were many difficulties connected with it; but there appeared to be a general feeling in that direction on both sides of the House. Nobody was anxious for annexation. Indeed, hon. Members on both sides of the House were desirous that that territory should not be extended; but, as regarded Zululand, that country was placed in such an unfortunate position, and they had incurred so many responsibilities in reference to it, that they were left but one course to pursue, and that was, as he had already stated, to annex it. The course taken by the Earl of Beaconsfield's Government, and by the Government of the right hon. Gentleman opposite, had brought upon Zululand difficulties of such a character that there was only one way by which they could discharge their duties towards that country, and that was by making themselves entirely responsible for its future administration. If they failed to do that, the present state of anarchy would continue, and the unfortunate state of things now existing would go on from bad to worse, until some Foreign Power would step in and do what they would certainly not like to see another Power do—namely, annex the territory themselves. He hoped that his right hon. Friends would consider whether the time had not come when the only course was to annex a country which had suffered so much from their hands; and however much they might dislike that course, and whatever amount of expense it would entail upon the country, it was the only proper course which followed from their past policy. But, while the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) had commented very strongly upon Zululand, he had not clearly gathered from the speech of his hon. Friend what he would be prepared to do.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he agreed very much with the views of his right hon. Friend.

Sir ROBERT FOWLER (Lord Mayor) said, he was glad to hear it, because he was sorry to say that he differed very much from his hon. Friend in the other part of his speech about Bechuanaland. His hon. Friend seemed to have a very low opinion of Sir Charles Warren. From that opinion he altogether differed. It appeared to him that Sir Charles Warren was one of the most admirable public servants Her Majesty had ever had the good fortune to possess. His proceedings in Bechuanaland had reflected great honour upon himself and upon the Government which he represented, and he thought it was the duty of the Government and of the House of Commons to support Sir Charles Warren in the course he was pursuing. He knew it was stated that there had been differences of opinion between Sir Charles Warren and another eminent public servant—Sir Hercules Robinson. He entertained the highest regard for Sir Hercules Robinson; he had received great kindness personally at the hands of Sir Hercules; but while he fully appreciated the ability and great public services of Sir Hercules Robinson, it appeared to him that if there were differences between those two distinguished men, then, certainly, Sir Charles Warren had been placed in a better position for acquiring information as to the course which ought to be pursued than Sir Hercules Robinson. The latter was, no doubt, in a difficult position, being the Constitutional Governor of the Cape. In that capacity he was obliged to take heed of the advice of the Ministry of the day, and it was very well known that the Ministry which happened to be in power at the Cape very much favoured the Dutch Party, by whom they had been returned. Moreover, being at Cape Town, Sir Hercules Robinson could not have that intimate knowledge of the affairs of Bechuanaland which an officer on the spot must possess. Sir Hercules Robinson was, as they all knew, a man who had administered the government of various great Colonies with eminent success, and he had had great experience in carrying out Constitutional Government; but his experience in connection with South Africa had been confined entirely to Cape Town. Sir Hercules Robinson had not travelled much in other parts of South Africa—indeed, he could not find that Sir Hercules Robinson had been out of Cape Colony at all since he (Sir Robert Fowler) was last in that country. Therefore, he thought that Sir Hercules Robinson could not have the same knowledge of the affairs of the interior of South Africa, and especially of the affairs of Bechuanaland, as the distinguished man who had been sent out upon a special Mission there by the late Government. Sir Charles Warren was a man who had acquired great experience of the Native Races in South Africa. He had witnessed tribal warfare; and it was generally felt by all who had paid attention to the subject—certainly by those who had spoken of it in that House—that no man was better qualified to administer the affairs of that Colony than Sir Charles Warren. Although Sir Charles Warren was sent out by the late Government, he believed that the appointment had received the universal approval of everybody in this country who was interested in the affairs of South Africa. Having gone out with great *prestige*, it was for the House of Commons to consider what had been the result of Sir Charles Warren's Mission. It must be borne in mind that, although he had been placed in a very difficult position, the general result of his administration had been most successful. It had been remarked a short time ago, in the debate upon the Afghanistan Frontier, that the only part of the world in which the late Government seemed to be carrying on their administration with advantage to the country was that part of South Africa in which Sir Charles Warren was acting. His hon. Friend the Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) had stated that military officers were apt to be indiscreet.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that what he had meant to say was, that when a military officer was indiscreet his conduct was apt to be dangerous.

The CHAIRMAN wished to point out that the discussion now taking place was not in Order upon the present Vote, but ought to be raised upon the Colonial Vote. His view was that any comments as to the sufficiency of the supply of provisions, forage, or upon transport, and other services connected with the Army, so far as Bechuanaland was concerned, would be legitimate; but the very wide questions of Colonial policy raised by the discursive speech of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell), which were now being continued by the right hon. Member for the City of London (Sir Robert Fowler), were altogether beyond the scope of this Vote.

SIR ROBERT FOWLER (LORD MAYOR) said, he had understood that the Vote referred to Bechuanaland, and he was prepared to discuss that question. His impression was, that however irregular any discussion about Zululand might be, any reference to the position of affairs in Bechuanaland came legitimately under the Vote. After the ruling of the Chairman, he would certainly confine his remarks to Bechuanaland. He was glad of the opportunity of bearing his humble testimony to what seemed to him to be the great merits of Sir Charles Warren, and he would express a hope that his right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies (Colonel Stanley) would see his way to give to that gallant officer the support to which his administration and his merits entitled him. There was only one other remark he would like to make before he sat down, and it was drawn from him by the speech of his hon. Friend. It might be argued that it would be a dangerous thing to involve themselves in any responsibility for maintaining the government of Bechuanaland, unless they were justified by the importance of keeping open the trade route. In his opinion that was an object of the very highest importance; it was absolutely essential that there should be an open route to the interior. If they were prepared to maintain their position in South Africa at all, they would have to make use of that route; and it was, therefore, necessary to maintain it and protect it, because, if it were destroyed, it would be a very great loss to this country in many respects. That was one of the reasons why he felt that the money spent upon Bechuanaland by this country was justified by the public interests involved. That being the case, he thought the Committee ought to support Sir Charles Warren's administration of affairs there, and should not object to it on the ground that it was expensive to this country.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he rose upon the question of Order. He wished to know whether it would be irregular for hon. Members to avail themselves of the opportunity, upon this Vote, of asking the Government to explain what their policy was intended to be in Bechuanaland? It was rather important to know whether the right hon. Gentleman considered that it would be out of Order to discuss the general policy of the Government in Bechuanaland, and also to understand distinctly whether the discussion upon that subject was to be stopped?

THE CHAIRMAN said, it was somewhat difficult to say what might or what might not be discussed under this Vote. It was a Vote for provisions, forage, and stores, in which there was undoubtedly an item for Bechuanaland; but it would be more orderly to confine the discussion to the question of provisions, forage, and stores. He took some blame to himself for not having stopped the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell), for certainly the Vote would not justify a lengthened discussion of questions relating to the entire Colonial policy of the Government. That discussion, however, could be brought on upon subsequent Votes. It would certainly not be regular to discuss the large question of the Colonial policy of the Government in relation to a Military Vote for provisions and forage.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, the view which he had taken of the question was that the great expenditure in connection with the occupation of Bechuanaland was the military expenditure. What he wanted to know was how much was likely to be spent; and it would certainly be impossible for the Government to give the Committee any idea of the amount that was likely to be spent, unless they were able to tell the Committee the purpose for which they proposed to remain in the country. He thought that in putting the question in that way he had placed himself in Order.

THE CHAIRMAN said, the discussion upon the general policy of the Government in Bechuanaland might be taken on Vote 6, Class V., which was a Vote that included money expended for administrative acts in connection with Bechuanaland and elsewhere. All those matters would be much more legitimately discussed on Vote 6, Class V.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that referring again to the question of Order, he wished to know whether the Chairman ruled that the question of policy did not now come up?

THE CHAIRMAN: Certainly; that is the effect of my ruling.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, that under those circumstances he would appeal to the Government to afford a full opportunity for discussing the question of policy, especially as he entirely disagreed in some of the remarks that had already been made. This matter of their Colonial policy in South Africa was a very important one, and, therefore, he trusted that the Government would afford a favourable opportunity for allowing the whole question to be fully discussed.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel STANLEY) said, that after the remarks which had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman, he wished to remind the Committee that these very Votes were postponed the other night in order to enable a general discussion to be taken. Whether such a discussion would be in Order or not was another matter. He was far from wishing to avoid discussion. He had expected that the discussion would have been taken on the Military Vote that afternoon; but according to the ruling of the Chairman that would be irregular, and, therefore, when the other Votes came on he would endeavour to assist his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) in bringing them on at a convenient hour, so as to afford, as far as was possible at that time of the year, a reasonable opportunity for such discussion as might be considered necessary. On the other hand, the Government were in a position of difficulty. The Committee knew very well that it was not only desirable, but that it would be absolutely necessary, to close Supply before long; but, at the same time, the Government would not refuse any concession in the way of time that would not be unusual or unnecessary. He was bound to warn the Committee, on the other hand, that it would not be his duty to make any startling announcement on the part of the Government until he had had more opportunity of seeing his way. All he could say now was that he had no desire to avoid a discussion on this important subject, and he would see that a fair opportunity of considering Vote 6, was afforded.

SIR ROBERT FOWLER (LORD MAYOR) expressed a hope that the Vote would not be taken that evening at an inconvenient hour. He would be glad if the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would say that, at all events, it would not be taken after 10 o'clock in the evening.

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) said, that if they could get through the Army Votes by a reasonable hour, there would be time to take the discussion on Bechuanaland. If that could not be done, the Government would be ready to take it the first thing on Wednesday. He trusted, however, that the Army Estimates might be finished in time for the Vote to come on at a reasonably early hour.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL hoped that, before the Vote was agreed to, the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War would answer the limited question he had put as to the military expenditure. How much did the right hon. Gentleman anticipate would be spent upon the Expedition to Bechuanaland in the course of the next six months, and, if the expenditure exeeded the provision already made, where was the extra money to come from?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) said, he would give the best answer he could to the question of the hon. Gentleman. He entertained a hope that the actual expenditure would not exceed the amount for which provision had been made; but it was impossible to say at present. The operations were being conducted at a very great distance from this country, and the communications were neither easy nor frequent. He could only say that nothing whatever had been provided out of the Vote of Credit for the operations there, nor was it intended to appropriate any portion of that Vote to those operations. He was afraid that it was impossible for him to give any further answer at present.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL wished to remind the right hon. Gentleman that the sum of £500,000 already voted had been avowedly taken for six months only. If there was reason to suppose that that would cover the operations for six months, it must be borne in mind that the six months would soon be out; and if it was intended to continue military operations longer, more money would inevitably be required.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) said, the hon. Gentleman was inviting him to enter into a discussion which the Chairman had already declared to be one of policy, and that was out of Order upon the present Vote. The statement as to how long the country was likely to be occupied would be made by the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and not by himself. All he wished to say was this — that, to the best of his knowledge and belief, the expenditure for which this Vote was taken would not be exceeded.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked whether, in regard to the Vote of Credit, the right hon. Gentleman considered that in the event of a necessity arising the Government would be at liberty to appropriate any part of it?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) said, there was no intention of trenching upon the Vote of Credit for that purpose.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT presumed that when the Colonial Vote came on for discussion the whole question of their Colonial policy might be gone into? He took it that that would be the time for stating the policy of the Government, and whether any further expenditure was likely to take place?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) said, that was his opinion. The administration of Bechuanaland and Zululand would come on under Class V., Vote 7, when the whole subject could be discussed.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL intimated that he would withdraw his Motion.

Motion by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question again proposed.

DR. CAMERON said, the subject to which he wished to draw attention was entirely germane to this Vote for forage and provisions. It was a question which had formed the subject of an action in the Westminster County Court a short time ago. It appeared that a man named Toomer contracted to supply the War Office with 300 tons of hay at 114*s.* per ton. Only 50 tons, however, were accepted by the War Office, who refused to carry out their contract after part of the hay had been delivered. Litigation ensued, and that litigation took place in the Westminster County Court; and, on the 12th of June, the jury returned a verdict against the War Office in favour of Toomer, the Judge refusing the War Office the right of appeal. A clerk from the War Office was reported to have produced various documents in which it was stated that it was unadvisable to give the contract to any one person. He would like to know why that was considered to be unadvisable? Any business man who wished to obtain a certain description of goods by contract had only to satisfy himself of two things — whether the tender he accepted was the lowest tender, and whether the person who made the lowest tender could give security as to his ability to carry out the contract. In this case the War Office refused to give the whole contract to Toomer. Toomer said the reason he did not get it was that he had exposed some frauds on a previous occasion; and he hinted, further, that his refusal to be a party to acts of bribery was the cause of his being dealt with in a summary manner. As he had said, Toomer offered to supply the whole 300 tons at 114*s.* a-ton; but he only got a contract for 50 tons. According to the evidence of Mr. Tupp, the rest of the hay was contracted for at a price 16*s.* per ton higher. One hundred tons were verbally contracted for at 130*s.* per ton, and the verbal contract was confirmed on the following day. The reason assigned for accepting a contract at a higher figure than that at which Toomer offered to supply the hay was that the authorities at Woolwich were very pressing in their demands. Evidence was given, on the trial of the case, that the market price on the day on which the contract was entered into was only 105*s.* per ton for hay delivered within a certain radius of the market, and that 5*s.* extra per ton would have covered the cost of cartage, and, therefore, that Toomer only asked for a moderate profit when he proposed 114*s.* per ton. But when the contract was rejected an action was brought against Toomer for 122*s.* per ton; and Mr. Tupp said that the contract ultimately entered into for the larger portion of the hay was at the rate of 130*s.* per ton. He (Dr. Cameron) thought that that was a very fishy transaction. The contract, they were told, was a verbal contract. Why was it a verbal contract? Before the Committee which sat last year, Mr. Nepean—the gentleman in whose office the contract was said to have been arranged—and Mr. Tupp himself, gave evidence that never, where it could otherwise be arranged, should a contract be verbal, but that a contract should always be a written contract wherever it was possible. It would be proved from the general regulations of the War Office that that was so, and that if any contract was made verbally it should at once be reported to the War Office. He might be told, perhaps, that this contract was not made verbally, but was simply arranged verbally; but that was a distinction without a difference. The Auditor General objected to certain contracts last year on the ground that they had been entered into verbally; and the Committee to which he had referred found fault, on similar grounds, with the laxity with which contracts were entered into not only by the War Office, but by other Departments. He had stated that, in the course of Toomer's trial, the most palpable suggestions of bribery were made. Anyone looking into the matter would see the extent to which suggestions of bribery were bandied about, and that when Mr. Nepean was before the Committee he gave as a reason for buying the hay that it was in order to escape the supervision of Woolwich, there being a ring there, and that some of the officials had been got at at Woolwich. That was not the only instance of this sort of charge. If they spoke to officers who had an intimate knowledge of this Department they would be told by them of their suspicions as to bribery in certain quarters. The other day he got a letter from a contractor, regarding whose contract the Committee upstairs had found it necessary to inquire last year. This gentleman spoke of the "ring" or "swing" outside of which no person could hope to compete successfully; and he offered, if he and others were afforded protection, to come forward and disclose the state of things which the contractors alleged to exist in regard to their trade. At the present moment, or very recently, a trial was going on at York in which some fraudulent contractors were concerned, and in that case an extensive system of bribery was exposed, which had exercised a most pernicious effect, as far as the interests of the Army were concerned. It came out that the contractor only supplied enough oats to give two feeds to the horses, when they were entitled to three. The meat for the men was dealt out in the same manner, and, instead of giving 18 lbs., by bribery, the contractor succeeded in giving only 12 lbs.; in addition to which, the meat was of an abominable quality, and mostly bull beef. John Chipchase, a journeyman butcher, gave interesting evidence as to the stuff palmed off upon the soldiers. The witness was asked to state the condition in which the meat was. He was asked—"When you first saw it, was it dressed?" In reply, the witness stated that when he first saw the meat some of it was laid out dressed—some of it had been dressed in the country, and some of the beasts had been fetched away in the carts, dead. Some of them only wanted sticking; and as they were stuck their last breath went out. He was interrogated as to the frequency with which that occurred, and he stated that it sometimes occurred five times a-week. When asked as to the cause of the death of the animals—what it was generally—he replied that it was sometimes milk fever, sometimes mouth complaint, some of the animals burst themselves, and some had what was called a turnip in their throats. Examined as to the wholesomeness of the meat, he stated that he should not like to eat it; and certainly he (Dr. Cameron) was inclined to agree with John Chipchase's view of the matter. He had only adduced this case to illustrate the sort of contractors with whom the authorities had to deal as Army contractors, and the absolute necessity for dealing with them in a most business-like and above-board fashion. He had mentioned the letter of the contractor, alleging that the authorities were open to bribery. The Director of Contracts, on being examined before the Committee, admitted that he had suspected certain officials at Woolwich, whom it was not difficult to identify. He believed that most of the Committee thought, as he (Dr. Cameron) certainly did, that the Director of Contracts referred to a particular officer, who had since been promoted; but he thought the fact of that gentleman's promotion showed that their suspicions in that case were wrong. One contractor, who was defended by Mr. Nepean, at the expense of this officer, had since been struck off the list of contractors, which certainly told rather against that particular individual. It proved to him (Dr. Cameron) that the matter ought to be probed to the bottom, and that there should not be constant attempts to burke any discussion or inquiry in regard to it. It would be necessary to go into the whole question in order to rectify the system. He, therefore, intended to move a reduction of the Vote, of which he had given Notice, in order that he might fully impress upon the Government the point which he wished to raise. He, therefore, proposed to reduce the sum for provisions by £10,000, and the sum for forage by £20,000; and he thought he could show that in the contracts entered into the country had lost £10,000 on the contract for flour, and £20,000 on the contract for hay. In respect of those two items—the flour purchased for the Army in Egypt amounted to 70 days' supply; and he asked the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War to the facts he proposed to lay before the Committee, because he was certain that, as a man well acquainted with business proceedings, and the manner in which a business contract ought to be carried out, the right hon. Gentleman would be of opinion that the course pursued in this matter was absolutely indefensible. There were 75 cases of flour purchased for the Army in Egypt, and sent out in five different consignments, which consisted of six different brands. The first was sent out in the *Austria* on the 24th of July. On the 21st of August, Sir John Adye sent it home, saying that it was utterly unfit for use, and never appeared to have been good. On the 7th of September, the *Arethusa* took out another consignment, and Sir John Adye reported that it was in no better condition. He said that the flour taken by that ship was utterly destroyed, and that the greater portion had arrived in hard solid blocks. The entire contents of a sack, in many cases, were a hard unbroken lump. Other witnesses described the flour as being in the form of lumps, like pillars of plaster of Paris. A telegram had been sent to Sir John Adye, saying that the flour had been selected especially for its keeping qualities, that it was shipped in good condition. and had had its bulk samples examined. A baker was allowed to attempt to utilize the flour for baking purposes by mixing it with flour purchased on the spot; but it was found to be absolutely worthless, and the whole lot was sold for the purpose of converting it into starch. Now, there was no article in the whole list of articles sent out in regard to which the Government ought to have had more experience than flour. The Navy was constantly in the habit of sending out flour to hot climates, and the authorities knew exactly the kind of flour which would keep, and the Commissariat officers were in the habit of making contracts all over the world in order to secure good flour for the use of the Army. Then, again, the authorities ought to have been warned against the kind of flour sent out in this case, because the flour sent out by the same Department in the Chinese War had gone wrong. The Naval authorities had not been consulted in the matter. The Commissariat General's advice was not taken. He recommended one course, and an entirely different course was adopted. The flour was bought through the means of a broker instead of being bought by the skilled officials of the Department. That was the most absurd manner of conducting business ever heard of. The broker who purchased the flour received a commission of 1¼ per cent. When contracts for provisions were made through the Commissariat the contracts themselves contained the most stringent provisions. When a contract was made for flour for use in hot climates the contractor was required to guarantee that it was of a quality that would keep. But in the case to which he referred no stipulation of the kind was made. The regular course of buying from a broker was described by the Director of Contracts. He said—

> "The Department sent for a sample, and when the sample was approved the broker was ordered to buy at a certain price on condition that the bulk agreed with the sample."

One would think that it was of some little importance, under such circumstances, to see the sample and compare it with the bulk. That was a very elementary proposition which would command universal consent; but in the purchases made by the War Office it would appear that the authorities never saw the samples at all except in one case out of the six brands ordered. There were six different brands of flour purchased, and in only one instance was the sample submitted to the Director of Contracts, or the Director of Supplies and Transports, and in that case the sample consisted of a very few ounces which had been so kept and kicked about the office that when it was wanted for analysis the chemist said it was altogether unfit for the purpose. No other sample of the remaining four consignments was examined by the War Office officials. More samples were said to have been taken, but they were not submitted to the War Office, and when they were wanted for purposes of comparison with the flour which turned out to be bad they were not forthcoming. He was told that in purchasing flour it was most important to analyze it in order to ascertain what percentage of moisture it contained. Mr. Lawson, the Assistant Director of Supplies, told the Committee that that course was not pursued in this case, and that there had been no analysis made or estimate taken in order to ascertain what per centage of moisture there was in the flour sent in. A certificate, however, was given which was to the effect that the flour was in good condition when shipped; but, as a matter of fact, that certificate was not from any Government official, but from persons employed in the docks who were *employés* of the Dock Company. The Government broker who bought the flour was, as he had said, paid by commission; but there was no stipulation whatever with him that he should not purchase his own goods. It appeared that in this case he was not an importer of flour, and, therefore, it was possible that such a stipulation might have been unnecessary; but there was an importer of oats on commission for the Government who was in a very different position, and there was nothing to prevent that broker from buying his own oats at the market price and getting the Government commission for purchasing them. He was told that there was nothing to prevent an individual in that position from obtaining a commission as seller as well as buyer. In no case was the transaction conducted in a business-like way or in such a way as an important Government contract ought to be carried out. He was told that the loss in this instance had not been very great, as the Government had managed to make a good sale of the starch into which the flour was converted in Egypt. But when the difficulty was to get through the work of furnishing supplies for the Army as rapidly as possible, surely that was not a time for exporting flour from England for the purpose of converting it into starch in Egypt. The direct loss in money, besides what was realized from the flour afterwards, might be considered also in conjunction with the freight, and the good flour on the spot that was lost in trying to mix it with the bad flour imported; and, in this case, there had been a direct loss upon this particular item of the sum by which he proposed to move the reduction of the Vote—namely, £10,000. He made the Government a present of the freight. All this business was simply the result of blundering, and blundering of the grossest kind. The Navy had sent out a quantity of flour by way of testing it, and it answered perfectly well. Moreover, Australian flour was sent out, and it also kept well in the Egyptian climate. The blundering was of the most unmitigated kind; but, notwithstanding all the exposure about Egypt, the same broker had been employed to conduct their contracts for the Soudan. In regard to the hay, a contractor at Liverpool contracted for upwards of 2,000 tons of hay, and received for it upwards of £20,000 sterling. There were differents contracts entered into at short intervals at different prices, and there was a great diversity of evidence between the Director of Contracts and the Director of Supplies and Transports as to who was responsible for the contracts. The Director of Contracts claimed that he was only responsible for one contract, and that, with regard to the other contracts, the Department of Supplies and Transports entered into them, and not himself. Evidence was given that, with regard to the first contract, which was to be for prime upland hay, no stipulation as to its age was made. The words "old hay" did not appear in the contract at all. There was a lame explanation of the omission; but it was admitted that the proper thing to have inserted would have been the word "old," especially as the dispute afterwards arose on that particular point. The hay was inspected by a Commissariat officer; but it was not inspected by a Commissariat officer appointed by the Department, but by one appointed by the General Officer of the district. The Commissariat officer of the Department was at the time occupied with duties at Chester which took up his entire time. That officer had been obliged to work Saturdays and Sundays, early and late, and even then was only able to make one or two perfunctory visits to the place where the hay was to be compressed and delivered. That officer, although not an officer of the Commissariat Department, was in constant communication with the Director of Supplies and Transports. The price of the hay was high; most of it was bought at £9 per ton. It was felt that that price required some justification, and the Director of Contracts and the Director of Supplies and Transports were asked how it was that they accounted for the price. The answer was that it was very easy to account for it, because as fast as the hay was bought it was taken away to be pressed, and was delivered pressed, the cost of pressing being set down at £2 a-ton. It was said that 30*s.* per ton at least would have to be allowed as a general charge for pressing; but it so happened that fault was found with the way in which this particular hay was pressed, and some evidence was taken as to the cost of pressing it in a perpetual hay-pressing machine. The Woolwich authorities sent up a tabulated statement of the cost which would have been incurred by adopting that plan, and, instead of amounting to 30*s.* a-ton, it was found to be only 4*s.* a-ton when done by a perpetual hay-pressing machine. Mr. Cousins — the contractor who sold the hay to the Government—stated that it was purchased from 100 different sources; but out of all the Reports upon it which came before the Committee there was only one that was favourable. One portion appeared to have been good, and was approved of; but the rest was condemned in the strongest and most unqualified terms by everyone who gave evidence in regard to it. If it were necessary, he would quote what the different officers had stated on the subject; what the Commissariat General said; what a subsequent Commissariat General said; what all the Assistant Commissariat Generals said; how it was criticized by the principal Veterinary officers; and also the opinion of Cavalry officers and others, who gave a written or verbal opinion upon the subject. To make the matter short, he might say that there was no question, from the evidence given before the Committee, that the hay was, to a very large extent, mildewed, rotten, full of rushes, and moss, and lowland meadow grasses. 500 tons of the hay were condemned at Liverpool and sold at a great loss, so utterly unfit was it for service even at home. A quantity of it was used as forage for mules. That did not pass through the accounts as having been lost; and other portions were utilized as bedding for horses, some of it having been actually sent out to Egypt as bedding, although the straw of that country could be obtained for very much less money. One thing was perfectly certain—that the whole of this hay, with the single exception of one lot which was favourably reported upon—the whole of this £20,000 worth of hay was entirely unfit for the purpose for which it was bought—namely, for forage for horses; and yet the contractor was complimented for the manner in which he had performed his contract, and he was a gentleman who held Army contracts to the extent of £1,200 per month. There was one point upon which he—the Army contractor—and Mr. Nepean differed. Mr. Cousins stated—"That at a recent interview he had had with Mr. Nepean, that gentleman had complimented and defended him." But Mr. Nepean denied that anything of the kind had occurred. The late Surveyor General of the Ordnance (Mr. Brand) told them the other night that he had from the first admitted that the flour was bad, and that the hay was bad. If such an admission was present in the mind of the hon. Member he had certainly managed to conceal it to a considerable extent. During the evidence given before the Committee every attempt was made to defend the contracts until a very late period in the investigation. The Committee were told that the hay had been packed in wet weather, and a table was sent in showing the number of wet days which occurred at Liverpool while the hay was been compressed. They were told that the hay had been deteriorated in consequence of its exposure to the Egyptian climate; and it was only under the pressure of cross-examination that the Committee were able to obtain an admission that the wet weather in England and the dry weather in Egypt could not account for rushes, moss, and lowland meadow grasses forming so large a portion of the hay. They were told that no steps had been taken for the recovery of the £20,000 which had been paid to the man who had sent in rubbishing materials that were not at all in accordance with his contract. They were told that it was not until a comparatively late period that the officials obtained any knowledge of the matter; that when the disclosures came out before the Committee the matter was looked into, and that it had been resolved to await the result of the Committee's Report. As a matter of fact, the Committee never did report; but, on the contrary, their inquiry was burked. They were now told that Mr. Cousins had been struck off the list of contractors; but that could only have been a month or two before he gave evidence at the very latest. Up to that time he had been enjoying permanent contracts to the tune of £1,200 a-month. He (Dr. Cameron) wished to know whether anything further was to be done? It appeared to him that there could not be the smallest doubt that the hay was not up to the contract. It was not prime upland hay of the best quality; and it appeared to him that it was the duty of the Government, under such circumstances, to bring an action against the contractor for the recovery of the money which had been paid to him under false pretences. The true facts of the case would then be brought out in all their nakedness, and the whole transaction would be then exposed, as in Toomer's case, and in the case of the York contractor. He believed that this was a very much worse case than that of Toomer, or of the York contractor, in both of which the Government had instituted an inquiry. There was no question about the villainous quality of the hay supplied as prime upland hay; and he would ask the Committee not to inflict the loss of £20,000, incurred by this transaction, on the country until at least some attempt was made to make the contractor refund the money which he had wrongfully received.

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ORDNANCE (Mr. GUY DAWNAY) said, that some of the cases to which reference had been made could not be gone into. One case was still *sub judice*, and therefore it would be improper to give an opinion upon it; and another—the case of Toomer—had already been decided, and decided against the War Office, in the Westminster County Court. In the latter case, the hay was not rejected as bad, but because it was required for a particular purpose for which it was not fitted. There was a considerable amount of clover in the hay, which prevented its being used for pressing; while, in the second place, the majority of the bales were of the wrong size and shape, and would not fit the pressing machine. The Government, therefore, refused to take it, and it became necessary to issue fresh tenders for hay. During the interval the market price had gone up considerably, and that which was purchased to replace the hay returned was bought at a considerably enhanced price. As regarded the hay and flour sent out to Egypt in 1882, and to which reference had again been made, he was still of the same opinion as that which he had expressed some weeks ago—that both the hay and the flour were bad. There could be no doubt that both were of an inferior quality and unfit to be used. The loss, however, was not in reality so great as the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) supposed. The quantity of hay sent out from Liverpool during the Egyptian War was 978 tons, and of that amount over 400 tons had to be used for purposes other than of forage, entailing a loss upon the country of £8,200. The real cause of this loss was the inadequacy of the inspection. Unfortunately it was impossible for one Commissariat officer to travel through an enormous extent of country in order to inspect the hay in every instance, and to see that the article thus inspected was that which was actually compressed afterwards and sent. If they wished to prevent such regrettable incidents, in the future, the only remedy that he could see was to augment the number of the officers of the Commissariat Department. As to the flour, the loss entailed upon the country was much less than the hon. Member for Glasgow had mentioned. The absolute loss in the difference of price at which the flour was bought and sold did not exceed £6,000; but the fact still remained that the country had sustained injury in consequence of the inferiority of the flour sent out. 1,945,472 lbs.

of flour were sent out to Egypt, and of that quantity 1,349,390 lbs. were proved to be of inferior quality, and could only be utilized for starch. It had been shown that it was a mistake to suppose that because flour was good in one part of Africa it was bound to be good in another. He could only attribute the fact that such views had ever been entertained to the geographical ignorance which existed upon the subject. He had himself been in both parts of that continent, and it was a mistake to suppose that because a certain kind of flour kept satisfactorily in the Transvaal or in Zululand, which was as regarded the coast line a most sub-tropical country, that it would answer equally well in the dry climate of the Suodan. The War Department recognized that errors had been committed, and it would take the lesson to heart and see that they did not occur again.

Mr. BRAND said, it had not been necessary for the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) to quote the evidence given before the Committee, because the hon. Gentleman knew very well that ever since that Committee sat, he (Mr. Brand) had admitted, both to the hon. Member and publicly in that House, that there were cases in which there had been a failure on the part of the War Department. But when the hon. Member spoke of the hay and flour, a distinction ought to be drawn. The first consignment of flour was the only lot about which complaint could be made; and in the case of the hay, only one consignment went bad—namely, a consignment bought at Liverpool, and no part of it was ever delivered to the troops during the campaign. He, therefore, wished to make these two reservations because they were facts. No doubt, a portion of the flour sent from this country went bad; but there was flour at hand to serve the purposes for which it was required, and some of the officers connected with the Expeditionary Force were of opinion that after the experience they had now gained it was impossible for any flour, sent out by ship to Egypt, to be delivered in that country in a good condition, and that it would be necessary, in future, to have recourse to local supplies. His hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow had gone into the case placed before the Select Committee in regard to the manner, mode, and method in which the flour was purchased. He (Mr. Brand) was speaking in the presence of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith), who, he thought, would corroborate what he said from his own knowledge—namely, that the flour purchased by the War Department, and consigned to Egypt, was purchased in the same way that all such purchases were conducted, in the City, for foreign countries. It was the custom to employ brokers of well known respectability who possessed a good name in the City, and to buy by sample. He admitted that, as far as possible, it was desirable to follow the sample and to examine some portion of the bulk in order to see whether it was the same as the sample. Still, it was out of the question to do that in every instance; and, on the whole, the best plan was to trust to the high character of the men they employed, and in that way to act upon the system adopted by the leading commercial firms in the City. His hon. Friend had not been quite correct in his statement with regard to the loss upon the Army flour; but he did not wish to make any particular point of it. He believed, however, that the loss had been £6,000, instead of £10,000 as stated by his hon. Friend. He would, however, pass by that subject with the single remark that they had now heard quite enough upon the question of the the flour sent out to Egypt during the war. He would like, however, to say a few words on the other question—namely, that of the hay. As to the supply of hay, he had to point out that there was nothing more difficult than to supply an Expeditionary Force sent out from this country with that article. After hearing the evidence given before the Select Committee, he had come to the conclusion that it would be impossible for the War Department to trust, in any way, to contractors for its supply, and the only way to meet the difficulty would be by extending the Government depôts for the purchase and storage and pressing of hay. It was desirable that they should get out of the system adopted at Woolwich, and have places for pressing hay in different parts of the country, and for developing, if possible, the supply at certain centres. The hon. Member for Glasgow had strongly condemned the late Government for having foreborne to prosecute a particular contractor. Now, that case had occupied his attention, more especially after the evidence given before the Committee. He had inquired into it carefully, and he would tell the hon. Gentleman that if, by any possible means, he could have seen his way to recommend the Secretary of State to prosecute the contractor he would have done so. He thought the hon. Member would fully believe that statement when he remembered that under the same Administration there had been the prosecution now going on at York, which he hoped would do a great deal of good in these matters, and there had also been the prosecution of the man Toomer. In point of fact, their reason for not taking proceedings in the other case was that they found they had no legal case against the contractor. The contractor had delivered the hay, according to his contract, to this extent. There was a clause in the contract which declared that the hay was to be subjected to the inspection of a Commissariat officer, and that it was to be passed by him. This hay was inspected by the Commissariat officer and was passed by him, and there could be no manner of doubt that if the War Department had prosecuted the contractor they would not have been able to have obtained a verdict. He would pass from this matter, and would merely refer, in a few words, to the case of Toomer, which had been mentioned by the hon. Gentleman. The facts of the case were these. The hon. Gentleman had addressed one or two questions to him upon the subject, and he had informed him privately to advise Toomer to defend his case in Court, so that any allegation he was said to have made as to fraud or bribery in regard to any person whatsoever might be exposed. The hay supplied by Toomer was not according to contract, and it was accordingly rejected. The Department then purchased as against the contract with Toomer, and as the contractor refused to pay the difference an action was brought against him. Toomer defended the case. The hon. Gentleman said that the verdict went against the War Office. No doubt that was so; but it did not prove that the verdict was right, and, in his (Mr. Brand's) opinion, the verdict was against the facts of the case.

Dr. CAMERON said, he had not raised that question.

Mr. BRAND said, his only object in mentioning the case was to point out the difficulties in which the War Department were placed in endeavouring to secure good supplies for the troops. They had rejected this supply because it was not according to contract, and because the hay was not of proper size; but the verdict was against them, and the jury evidently thought that, whether it was of proper size or not, the War Office ought to have taken it. The facts in regard to the purchase were these, and he would give them to the Committee as concisely as he could. On the 7th of March, in the present year, a contract was completed for 200 tons of hay with one firm, and for 250 tons of hay with two other firms. The hay came in very slowly, and as there was great pressure for a supply, Toomer was asked to send in a tender for 300 tons. On the 10th of March there were only 18 tons in store, and very great pressure was being used to procure a further supply on account of the Expedition to the Soudan. Toomer was pressed for 50 tons to go on with, and those were the 50 tons the hon. Gentleman had alluded to. They might have been bought under a verbal contract under pressure; but the contract was accepted and passed. On the 13th of March 114 tons were contracted for at 121*s.* per ton, and other tenders were accepted for 100 tons at 127*s.* per ton, 200 at 132*s.* per ton, and 100 at 137*s.* per ton. He quite admitted that the market price was 105*s.* 6*d.*; but the Government were obliged to accept the higher terms on account of the emergency of the case, the difficulties they were under, and the great pressure that existed for a supply. Unfortunately, the authorities at Woolwich were in the hands of a limited number of contractors; and all he could say in regard to this and the other cases quoted by the hon. Gentleman was that the only remedy was to keep out of that limited area of supply, and to establish further Government depôts. He believed that at the time the contract was entered into with Toomer the War Office did the best thing they could under the circumstances, and it was not their fault if the hay supplied was of an inferior quality. They had prosecuted the contractor for his default, and he held that the verdict given by the jury in the case was entirely wrong.

Mr. RYLANDS said, he was not quite satisfied with the explanation which had just been given by his hon. Friend the Member for Stroud (Mr. Brand). So far as the explanation of the hon. Gentleman the present Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Guy Dawnay) was concerned, he would only say that it tended to support the contention of his hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron). The hon. Gentleman, to a certain extent, disclaimed any responsibility for transactions which occurred before the advent of the present Government; and, therefore, it was natural for his hon. Friend who had just spoken to offer an explanation on behalf of the late Government, who were responsible in these particular cases. He thought they should dismiss altogether the question as to the amount of loss; whether it might have been £5,000, £6,000, or £10,000. The question rather was, who was responsible for the loss? because he believed the circumstances to which his hon. Friend alluded, and which would be fully in the recollection of the Joint Committee on which both he and the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Guy Dawnay) had sat—he believed those circumstances pointed to the unsatisfactory mode in which the Government Business was carried on in regard to supply and demand in connection with the requirements of the Public Departments. It might be a popular delusion, but he could say that it was a delusion most generally shared in, that in regard to a very large class of these contracts there were means taken by corruption to secure advantages at the expense of the country. He believed that there had been a number of instances in the transactions which had taken place in which goods had been accepted and sent out which were afterwards found to be of inferior quality. No such transactions could possibly take place in connection with any private administration. Why was it that these things occurred? The fact was that the Government had a number of officials, who, he was afraid, in some cases, allowed themselves to be tampered with in connection with these contracts. His hon. Friend (Mr. Guy Dawnay) had alluded to the question of flour. In the first instance, he supposed his hon. Friend assumed that there had been no blame in regard to that flour. [Mr. Guy Dawnay dissented.] His hon. Friend shook his head, but he said that the flour was bought upon certain samples, and was sent out. It was admitted that it was badly sent out; but it was asserted that it was not the flour that was at fault, but the conditions of climate and transport which led to the injury rather than the badness of the flour. Was that so or not? Was it a fact that this particular flour was sent out under such conditions of climate and transport as necessarily to render it unfit to be used when it reached its destination? He understood that American and Australian flour, which had been sent out under the same conditions, was found fit to be used, and that assertion had not been contradicted. He had, therefore, the greatest doubt as to the correctness of the belief of the hon. Gentleman that it was impossible to send out flour to those hot climates without exposing it to the risk of destruction.

The SURVEYOR GENERAL of ORDNANCE (Mr. Guy Dawnay) said, what he had stated was this—that the brands of flour sent out to Egypt were brands grown in a moist climate, which were bound to go bad when they were sent over for use in a very hot and dry climate. Any flour grown in America under the same conditions, if sent out to Egypt, in the same way, would also go bad, and was bound to go bad.

Mr. RYLANDS could only say, then, that that kind of flour ought not to be sent out at all, and he could not understand why it was sent. Was the Director of Supplies so ignorant as not to know the kind of flour that would keep in hot climates? He would not say that the information given by the hon. Gentleman was not correct; but why was it that this kind of flour was sent? If a wrong kind of flour was sent out somebody must be responsible. The complaint he made in regard to these Government transactions was that when there were blunders committed and losses incurred the country had to pay for them, and yet it was impossible to put their hand upon anybody who was responsible. He had known cases occur, over and over again, in Government Departments, which in a private administration would have led to the immediate discharge of the offender; but which in these Government Departments only brought about a mild reprimand, probably followed, shortly afterwards, by promotion. He could mention cases which had occurred in the Navy, and in other Departments, in which great loss and great injury had been sustained by the country, and after considerable inquiry blame was attached to a certain individual, but he was let off with a slight reprimand which was soon forgotten; and not long afterwards the same officer obtained promotion in the Service. As to this flour, after the admission which had been made by the Department, somebody must have been responsible for sending out a description of flour to Egypt which ought to have been known to be unsuited to that particular climate; but, of course, these admissions freed the contractor. He must say that he had been much struck by the statement of his hon. Friend that while in regard to the flour the only condition was that it was to be equal to sample, there was only one sample taken of the whole quantity supplied, and even that was regarded as of so little importance that it was never of any use, and it was found impossible to analyze it when it became necessary to test the quality of the flour, or to ascertain whether it was equal to sample or not. He understood now, from the objection of the Front Benches, that the contractor in this case supplied the flour on condition that he should not be responsible for its going bad. Therefore, the contractor could not be blamed; but he thought that a great reflection was cast upon the Department for having allowed such flour to be sent out at all. If his hon. Friend persisted with his Motion for a reduction of the Vote, he (Mr. Rylands) would certainly vote with him. He now came to the hay, and the supply of hay to the Expeditionary Force was, he must confess, a very unsatisfactory affair altogether. They had a very large quantity of hay to provide, and a contractor was employed by the Government to buy it. As he understood, the contractor bought it from a considerable number of producers, and shipped it; but when it reached Egypt it was found that a very large portion of the hay was bad. This was not the case of one bad parcel of hay supplied by one sub-contractor; but, as he understood, the general quality of the hay supplied by this particular contractor was bad. Then, what was the natural conclusion? The only conclusion was this—that this contractor, when he gathered together from various quarters hay for the purpose of carrying out the Government contract, intentionally gathered it together at low prices, and of inferior quality, and that the Government accepted it at full prices. He dared say that the Government believed, at the time, that the hay was good; but it was admitted now that it was bad. His hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) very properly urged that when the Government found out the condition of the hay, and discovered what was, on the face of it, a fraud, or at any rate a serious breach of contract, it was naturally to be supposed that the Government would have taken proceedings against the contractor in a Court of Law, with a view of recovering payment from the contractor to make good the injury done to the public by the supply of bad articles. His hon. Friend the Member for Stroud (Mr. Brand) said the Government were of opinion that they had no legal case against the contractor. He wished that his hon. Friend, after having considered the matter carefully, had come to a different conclusion. He wished that he had gone into a Court of Law. At all events, the whole facts of the case would have been laid before the public, and the whole proceedings of the contractor would have come out. It was almost a miracle to suppose that if a man wanted to obtain a *bonâ fide* article in the market, and purchased it from different producers, that every particle of it would have turned out bad unless there had been some fraud in the matter. If the Department had placed the case clearly before a jury, they would have found out how it was that these contractors had been able to palm off this bad hay on the Government. At all events, he should have liked the action to be brought. But then his hon. Friend said that the agent of the Commissariat Department had passed it. What had become of the agent? They had not been told that, and he should very much like to know what had been done with the individual who was responsible for all this bungling. Had he been promoted or had he been discharged? Perhaps he had been retired on full pay, or, as his hon. Friend near him suggested, perhaps he had been pensioned. But there was this point—whenever these things occurred nobody seemed to be punished; and his contention was that the proper course for the Government to pursue when any great public loss or injury had arisen either from neglect or inefficiency on the part of a Government official—not to put it on any worse ground—was to discharge that Government official. He would deal with Government officials in just the same way as, under similar circumstances, officials in private Companies would be dealt with. If the Government did not do that, they would never get clean-handed officials, and never get efficient administration. He believed his hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow had done an admirable service in bringing these cases before the House with such ability. He (Mr. Rylands) said that the manner in which these great spending Departments were administered must necessarily lead to the loss of millions in the course of a year, owing to maladministration, wasteful expenditure, and the existence of a system of which he believed the great body of the people of the country had not the slightest conception. When they voted large sums of money year after year, they naturally expected that those sums of money were expended to the best advantage; but he believed they would learn some day that they were not spent to the best advantage—that there was a great deal of blundering in the Public Services under a system which could only lead to public loss. He believed that the time would come when the present system would not be allowed to continue, and when it would be demanded that if public servants did not do their duty the Department should take care that they did not remain in the Public Service.

Mr. J. W. BARCLAY said, he thought that the debate had shown such a want of competence on the part of the officials of the Department as to create great fear with regard to any similar Expedition that might in future leave these shores. With regard to the contract for flour, the purchase seemed to have been brought about in a sufficiently business way; but the mistake was that the person who ordered the flour did not know what kind of flour ought to be ordered. But he understood that the special qualities of flour for exportation were well known; and, that being so, the War Office might have inquired at the Admiralty as to the proper kind of flour for the purpose of the Expedition. He did not think that flour could be purchased in any better way than through a respectable broker in the City, which was the usual way of doing the business; but he thought that the War Office ought to have made absolutely certain of the quality of all the stores before they left; it was too late to find out that they were unsuitable after they had left the country. He thought that the authorities should take measures, by means of their own servants, to satisfy themselves that the stores were of the proper description, and suitable for the purpose for which they were required. Then with respect to the hay. The hon. Gentleman who had spoken on this question from the Treasury Bench (Mr. Guy Dawnay) had told the Committee that an officer had been ordered to examine the hay, and that he found it impracticable to do so. He (Mr. Barclay) understood that the hay was all pressed at one place, and what any business man would have done would be to send to the pressing establishment a competent and trustworthy man—a man who knew about hay—to examine it at the time the pressing was going on. There was no difficulty about seeing the quality of hay when it was being pressed. It practically amounted to this—that a contract was entered into for hay; that the hay was never inspected; that it was taken on the nominal certificate of an officer who said he had not time to inspect it and discharge the duties entrusted to him. He thought that indicated gross neglect on the part of the War Office, who ought to have taken measures to have the hay inspected before it was shipped. Again, it was absurd to enter into a contract for hay, and take delivery without ascertaining that it was in good order and condition. The clear duty of the War Office in this case was to satisfy themselves, at the time of delivery, that the hay was of the quality contracted for. He was told also that the Government paid 135*s.* for hay which was sold in the market at 105*s.* To anyone who knew anything about hay he was afraid that would seem very absurd, because a very much less price than 135*s.* would bring hay from all parts of the country to Woolwich. The difficulty was that the Government could not get a sufficient number of contractors who would submit to do what it was understood was necessary in order to get War Office contracts; that was the familiar explanation of the reason why the War Office could not get contractors to come forward in sufficient numbers. He said that these contracts should be advertised throughout the country, and that it should be understood that the Government would take hay from all subject to strict examination. If that were done he had no doubt that the Government would get any quantity of hay that they wanted; because the difficulty that existed in the minds of the contractors was as to whether there would be fair play and justice on the part of the Government Department when they came to make delivery of their goods. If the hon. Gentleman would devote his attention to this part of the subject he would inspire hay dealers throughout the country with the feeling that there would only be straight dealing; and then he was convinced that there would be no difficulty whatever in the War Department getting all the supply of good hay which they might require, and that at a reasonable price.

MR. BRAND said, the hon. Member for Forfarshire (Mr. Barclay) had stated with regard to the hay bought at Liverpool that it was passed by the Commissariat officer, and that that officer had stated that he could not inspect the hay. He (Mr. Brand) was able to say that that officer had represented that he could not do the work; that he was overworked; and that the War Office instructed another officer in the district to give him some assistance.

MR. J. W. BARCLAY said, he thought it would simplify matters very much if the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Brand) would state that some officer authorized by the authorities in the district was present during the time that the hay was being pressed at Liverpool, and that he certified that the hay was of satisfactory quality.

MR. BRAND: That was so.

MR. GOURLEY said, they had to deal with two complaints, one with regard to the bad hay and the other with regard to the unsound flour that had been sent out to the Soudan. No one would say that any Department of the War Office should be held responsible, other than the Secretary of State or the Duke of Cambridge, for sending out that bad hay and flour. It had been stated that the hay was extra pressed in Liverpool. He (Mr. Gourley) believed that the hay that was sent was in all probability Dutch, which cost about £3 10*s.* a-ton. It would thus be perceived by the Committee that the contractor could in that way, if he liked, rob the country of something like £3 a-ton, the difference between the price of the hay and what the War Office paid for it. He thought that the proposal of the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) was a very reasonable one—namely, that the present officials, instead of following in the steps of their Predecessors, should bring an action against the contractors who supplied hay of a quality totally different from that which they agreed to supply. Then, with regard to the flour, was the Committee to understand that the War Office did not know what sort of flour was proper to be sent to hot climates? Evidently, this appeared to be the case, the Chiefs knowing about as much as the man in the moon regarding a business for which they were drawing heavy salaries, the reward of political claptrap. The only kind that could be sent with safety was kiln-dried flour, and he hoped that the Commissariat Department of the War Office would bear that in mind.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he had had a great many communications from contractors and others who supplied hay, to the effect that there was a worthy gentleman at Woolwich who was a particular friend of the officials, and somehow or other when the hay was sent in it never gave satisfaction, and the contract was given to some estimable gentleman who was a friend of the individual referred to. That was the story that was told. He did not know whether the Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Guy Dawnay) intended to look into the matter thoroughly; he did not want to make any particular charges; but, from what he gathered from the correspondence he had had with contractors, he was convinced that something ought to be done down at Woolwich. Now, this question of hay had created difficulties in several parts of the country. He believed there was a prosecution going on in connection with it at York, and Quartermasters and others were being taken away from their duties in consequence. If the hon. Gentleman would go into the subject he had alluded to with regard to Woolwich he believed he would find that great changes might be made there with advantage to the Public Service.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) said, that the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), in asking the Government to consent to a diminution of this Vote, placed them in a difficult position. This money was not to be paid for flour and hay in the past, but for hay and other supplies in the future; and, therefore, by putting them to the necessity of dividing against his Amendment, he placed them in a very unsatisfactory position. All he could say was that, as far as it lay in his power, he would endeavour to secure that the business of the Department should be properly done; and he was convinced that his hon. Friend the Surveyor General of Ordnance would spare no exertion to secure that any irregularities that had occurred in the past should not be repeated in the future. As to what had been said with regard to Government officials accepting bribes, he was not there to defend particular institutions; and if it was possible to point out a single case of the kind, the hon. Member for Glasgow might be assured that he and his hon. Friend would spare no effort to remove the person against whom an act of the kind could be proved. But his experience of the great majority of public servants was such as to compel him to acknowledge that they served the country efficiently and purely. Reference had been made to the case of the contractor who had delivered hay of a character totally unsuited to the purposes it was intended for, and very much below the quality undertaken to be delivered. Well, the hon. Member for Stroud (Mr. Brand), the late Surveyor General of Ordnance, felt that he could not prosecute in this case. He (Mr. W. H. Smith) would look into the subject again, and if his opinion as to the proper course to be taken differed from that of his hon. Friend the Member for Stroud, he was sure he would not object to serve the country by assisting in doing what was necessary. But he hoped the Government would not be pressed to consent to the reduction of the Vote, because, as he had pointed out, it would place them in an awkward position.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, that the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had made one or two statements which he was very glad to hear fall from him. The first statement was that he recognized that in this particular contract there was something particularly unsatisfactory. The second statement was that the great body of public servants in the country had shown themselves above suspicion with regard to anything in the nature of corruption. The right hon. Gentleman had gone on to say that if, on further consideration, there appeared any likelihood of obtaining satisfaction by action at law, that action should be taken. A legal friend of his, who was present when the case to which reference had been made was going on, had expressed his astonishment to him that such a rotten case should have been taken into Court. He understood that in actions of the kind the most overwhelming case had to be made out. But he said that, in justice to the whole body of Civil servants, the present Minister for War would do well to institute within the limits of his own Office strict inquiries as to who were the officials responsible in this case. It was due to the whole Service, if there were persons connected with it who were implicated in anything like unfair dealing, that they should be punished. It was perfectly obvious that if there had been anything like fraud with regard to this hay there must have been some amount of collusion. Therefore, he thought the House would look for a searching investigation into all the circumstances connected with the contract for, and delivery of, the articles in question. It was well known that persons guilty of delinquencies were sheltered in a manner that was extraordinary. He remembered the case of a high official who embezzled money, and who, instead of being prosecuted, figured on the pension list at the first opportunity. The case was partly investigated, but the man was not removed; the then Chancellor of the Exchequer expressed his opinion that he ought not to have been on the pension list, but in the dock at the Old Bailey. He (Mr. A. O'Connor) hoped that the present War Minister would leave no stone unturned to discover, no matter whether it was an official or other person, who had been concerned in anything like collusion in this matter; and he hoped also that when that person had been discovered he would be treated as he deserved.

DR. CAMERON said, after the statement and explanation of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, he would be satisfied in not pressing his Amendment to a division. He was quite certain, whether the right hon. Gentleman gained or lost in any proceedings he might take against the contractors, that the public would think he had done perfectly right in bringing his action. If he would take counsel with his right hon. and learned Friend the Judge Advocate General (Mr. Marriott) he believed that he would possibly put him in the way of recovering from the contractors some portion of this money. They had been told that only one consignment of flour was bad; but he had read that the second consignment was bad also, and that all the flour was in a condition utterly unfit to be used. Attention had been called to the case of the Commissariat officer, who made a nominal inspection; but he trusted that a scapegoat would not be made of that officer, who had assured the Committee that he could not possibly have overtaken his work; that he had done his best; that he had worked night and day, and who had given his evidence in such a way as, without sheltering himself, to make a favourable impression on the Committee. If the right hon. Gentleman was going to look into the matter, let him look into the conduct of those gentlemen connected with the Supply and Transport Department and the Department of the Director of Contracts, who bought six different kinds of flour, and made five consignments of it on a sample contract, and who never saw that the flour was up to sample. If the right hon. Gentleman wanted a scapegoat let him look for him in that direction. They were told that the flour was bought in the usual manner. Why, that was the very thing he protested against. He had not said one word against the military officials at the War Office—he was speaking of the civilian officials. The country, at a great expense, kept up a Commissariat Department at head-quarters, and the Commissary General received £1,500 a-year. In that Department there were men of great experience, men who so to speak had gone through the mill, and who understood the whole business. He complained that the Commissary General had protested against the flour being sent out, and that his protest was of no avail. The country, as he had said, kept a number of gentlemen, the Commissary General, with assistants, at great expense, and their services were not utilized. In war time they were put aside, and the whole duty of providing for the Army was put into the hands of War Office clerks, who put themselves into the hands of the first contractor who presented himself, and who probably knew as little of the special requirements of the case as they did. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would thoroughly look into the whole matter, and thereby perform a great public service.

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(2.) £801,500, Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies.

MR. SCLATER-BOOTH desired to call the attention of the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) to the change which took place some years ago in the mode of dealing with soldiers' worn-out clothing. It was a very important change, affecting, as it did, the Army generally and the interests of private soldiers, and the traders in the clothing in particular. He did not know whether the change to which he alluded was brought to the notice of the House by the Secretary of State for War in 1881. He had no doubt it was; but, judging from the statement which the Minister for War generally made in introducing the Estimates, he thought its importance was forgotten. It was the practice formerly for soldiers to be permitted to dispose of their own old clothing. That permission was, he believed, summarily withdrawn, and the whole of the old clothing was disposed of by the War Office. That was a very great change, and if it was not brought before the House in a systematic way at the time it was made it ought to have been. But, whether that were so or not, the time had certainly arrived when public attention should be called to the question, and when the Minister for War, especially a Minister just coming to his duties, should be asked to say whether he was satisfied the change had been made without any prejudicial effects. He (Mr. Sclater-Booth) noticed that in the Vote the Committee was now asked to pass no less a sum than £50,000 was set down as the result of the sale of the old clothing. It was a rather remarkable fact that the same sum was set down last year. He should be glad to know whether that sum represented the net produce of the sales, and whether it was the sum at which there was a contract for the disposal of the whole of this enormous quantity of old stores? If £50,000 was, according to his hypothesis, the measure of the State's gain by the change, it was also the measure of the soldier's loss. If the sum were divided amongst soldiers of the Army quartered in England—he supposed the system did not extend beyond the Channel—each man would receive a substantial amount. There had been many letters in the newspapers from officers calling attention to this matter, which they regarded as a great grievance to the soldier; in fact, in some of the letters published in a most respectable daily paper a year and a-half ago what had been done was spoken of as absolute robbery. He had no doubt that some contingent advantages were given to the soldier at the time to compensate him for the withdrawal of this privilege; but he must say that, if he were a private soldier, he should view with some jealousy the way in which this privilege had been taken from him. But, whether justice was done to the soldier in the first instance or not, some explanation was demanded in the matter. The men who had enlisted since the change had come in, of course, under the new system, therefore they could not complain of any breach of contract; but he was told that the system was unpopular, and that it worked badly, especially in certain regiments. Formerly it was the practice of soldiers to hold over their old uniforms to wear on fatigue duty, or at other times when they were not required to be dressed in their best. He understood that, since the new system came into force, soldiers had been seen performing their fatigue duties in their new uniforms turned inside out for fear they would destroy their clothes. He quite agreed that there were other interests to be consulted in the decision of this question besides that of the private soldier—for example, the interest of the officers of the regiment. He was told that officers complained very much of the want of these second suits of clothes for the soldiers, and that they found the deterioration of the new uniforms so great that they connived at the men keeping back their old articles of clothing, and so, as it were, brought themselves into conflict with the new system. He was told also that the accumulation of old clothing in certain quarters had been so great as to be positively injurious to the health of the men living near the store house, and that the contractors had failed to perform the duties they had undertaken. He was told that officers of standing lamented the change; that they considered it was not only injurious to the appearance and discipline of the regiments, but distinctly contrary to the interests of the men themselves, because the terms of the contracts were such that, although men might be required by the Regulations of the Service, and by the interest of the regiment, to lay out their own money in repairing their clothing, they were, nevertheless, obliged to surrender the clothing to the contractor without receiving anything for what they had done to it. So much for the soldiers and the regiments. Now, with regard to the contractors. The former practice was for the clothing to be sold, under proper regulations, to the persons who collected at the different head-quarters in order to deal in these old stores. Do not let it be said that there was any misappropriation of stores belonging to the Crown, or that these people were carrying on an unlawful trade. Nothing of the sort. The dealers in these stores were encouraged by the then system to establish themselves in the different regimental districts, and they were licensed by the Assistant Adjutant General or some other official to deal in these stores, and the soldiers were only allowed to part with their clothing under certain regulations. He believed it was not alleged that there was any fraud or malpractice under the old system. It was, no doubt, found by Generals commanding important districts that some of the clothing found its way among the lower classes, and was worn in the streets; indeed, he believed it was very much in consequence of the fact that civilians were sometimes seen wearing soldiers' worn-out garments that these old stores were now dealt with in a very much larger way than heretofore. Large contracts were now concluded; but hon. Members had no knowledge how they were made. Certainly, they were not concluded under any system of public tender, or in a way which was at all satisfactory to the traders, who were encouraged for many years to deal in the stores, and who suddenly found themselves deprived of their business. Take the case of Aldershot. He was informed that no less a sum than £10,000 was kept continually floating in the transactions connected with soldiers' old clothing. The people who had established themselves in that populous place with a view of administering to the wants and profiting by the needs of the soldier population had been, by the fiat of the War Office, ousted from their business. He understood that now the old clothing found its way to the Eastern Counties, and was there converted into shoddy. The War Office and the House could not altogether disregard the feeling of those traders, who had conducted themselves with propriety, and who, owing to a piece of caprice on the part of the War Office, had found themselves ousted from an honourable employment. He should be glad if his right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith), or the Surveyor General (Mr. Guy Dawnay), if that Gentleman replied to him, would assure him that this subject should receive his attention, and should be considered, in the light of the experience of the last four years, dispassionately, and with a desire to find out what there was to be said against the change as well as in favour of it. All he asked was that inquiry should be made, and that the soldiers, public, and traders should receive the benefit of it. Some time ago he asked a Question of the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) on the subject; but the answer he received was ambiguous and unsatisfactory. It was due to the private soldier that they should know they had not been deprived of a privilege which they had valued; and it was due to the traders in old clothing, many of whom were old Army pensioners, that they should know they had not been ousted from a reasonable and proper employment except for the very best reasons.

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ORDNANCE (Mr. GUY DAWNAY) said, he had listened to the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sclater-Booth) with considerable surprise, because he did not understand whether the right hon. Gentleman had called attention to this subject in the interest of the slop-dealer, of the country, or of the soldiers. He (Mr. Guy Dawnay) was perfectly satisfied that the change of system had worked exceedingly well for the men and for the country. The right hon. Gentleman must be aware that under the old system it was the commonest thing in the world for the men to make away with their uniforms—indeed, it was chiefly owing to this fact that the country came to the conclusion that the whole system must be changed. The present system was this—that instead of allowing the slop-dealers to barter with the soldiers for their old clothes, and in many instances get them for a mere song, all the old clothing was got together in store, and then sold to contractors for what came to a very considerable sum of money —£50,000. The soldier did not lose, but directly benefited by the change. Instead of getting what he used to—a few shillings for his worn-out garments —the soldier now got a suit of blue serge, when he first joined as a recruit, a new forage cap annually, and an entirely new suit of civilians' clothes on discharge. The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sclater-Booth) said that complaints had been sent in by Commanding Officers. He (Mr. Guy Dawnay) had made some inquiries on the subject, and he had found that the change worked very satisfactorily as regarded the men; he certainly had heard no complaints from Commanding Officers. There was another point the right hon. Gentleman mentioned, but in regard to which he laboured under a mistake. The right hon. Gentleman said it was very hard that the men should have their old clothing taken from them, and be compelled to do fatigue duties in their new uniforms. As a matter of fact, the men were allowed to keep their old uniforms for a year, and use them for fatigue duties. He could not say how long that rule had been in force; but he thought that every soldier in the Army at the present moment thoroughly understood it. In his opinion, the change worked exceedingly well for the Army and for the country.

LORD EUSTACE CECIL said, he cordially agreed with a great deal of what was said by the Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Guy Dawnay). The hon. Gentleman began by saying, however, he did not quite understand the right hon. Gentleman's (Mr. Sclater-Booth's) speech. He (Lord Eustace Cecil) could not think that anyone in the House was so innocent as that. Personally, he was convinced that his right hon. Friend had every wish to do what was right by the soldier, as well as what was right by the country and the trader. He (Lord Eustace Cecil) was in favour of Free Trade; but he was also in favour of fair trade. Anything that could be fairly done on the part of the War Office for a class of traders like the slop-dealers ought to be done; but he was by no means anxious or willing to sacrifice the true interests of the country in the matter. He, in common with others, was responsible for the introduction of the new system; and he believed it had worked exceedingly well. He entirely agreed with what his hon. Friend the Surveyor General said as to the advantages to the soldier; but he did not think the hon. Gentleman quite stated what the money advantages of the change was, and stress had been laid upon that point. Besides getting a new uniform and certain articles of under-clothing every year, the soldier received a suit of civilian clothes of the value of 30*s.* on his discharge—that was equal, in the case of an Infantryman and Cavalryman, to 6*s.* a-year. It was seen, therefore, that, as far as the private soldier was concerned, there was a good deal of misunderstanding out-of-doors. His belief was that the private soldier really did benefit instead of lose by the change. But he was not in a position to say definitely how the matter stood with the trader. His impression was, however, that the smaller traders undoubtedly benefited by the old system. They went into barracks, and made their own bargains with the soldiers—whether good or bad he was not there to say—and they were often able to sell the clothes at a very great advantage. He knew that now there was a monopoly on the part of the big traders in this matter, and that the smaller traders complained very bitterly. If there would be no disadvantage to the Service—and he did not know that there would be—he thought it would be worth his hon. Friend's consideration whether, by holding more frequent sales at various centres, an equal advantage could be given to the small trader as to the large trader. If the present monopoly could be got rid of in some such way as he suggested, he felt sure his right hon. Friend (Mr. Sclater-Booth) would be perfectly satisfied.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he thought his right hon. Friend (Mr. Sclater-Booth) had done good service in calling attention to this subject, because he had been the means of it being made clear that the soldier did materially benefit by the change. With regard to the second point the right hon. Gentleman referred to, he (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) agreed with his noble Friend (Lord Eustace Cecil) that if the monopoly could be done away with, and the trade more generally distributed, it should be. But he rose more particularly to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) whether he was determined to preserve red as the colour of the clothing of the Army of this country? He was told that the cotton khakee which had been issued to their soldiers had been a perfect failure. He was told, too, that cotton khakee had been issued instead of serge khakee, to the great detriment of the health of the troops using it. Cotton khakee, he was informed, was very bad material for troops on service, especially abroad. What was wanted was clothing which would absorb the perspiration, which cotton khakee failed to do. He hoped that red serge jackets would be re-issued to their men, because, in his opinion, it would be infinitely better to keep to their old colour than to resort to any other colour. A red jacket might become stained, but it still retained a red mark in it; and whenever a red line was seen advancing it was well known that it was a line of English soldiers. It was the opinion of a large number of officers, who knew most about these things, that red clothing was the very best that they could possibly have for their Army. He mentioned that because, in these times, it was very often found that, unless questions were brought forward very prominently, the country was involved in changes at which it was exceedingly annoyed.

The SURVEYOR GENERAL of ORDNANCE (Mr. Guy Dawnay) said, there had been no disposition at any time on the part of the Government to deal unfairly with the small traders. There was no actual monopoly at that moment; but it had been found there were only two firms—one Messrs. Hallett, and the other Messrs. Moses—who had given satisfactory tenders for the old clothing. Last year the clothing was sold to Messrs. Hallett; this year it had been purchased by Messrs. Moses. One great reason why it was to the interest of the country that all the old clothing should be bought by one firm was that no old uniform was allowed to be re-sold in this country. The buyer was obliged to undertake to ship the goods away; and there were not many firms in the country who were in a position to buy this large amount of clothing, and who had such relations with other countries as enabled them to dispose of it. With regard to the observations which had fallen from his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot), he had to say that there was no disposition at all to change the colour of the uniform of the Army from the good old British colour of red, except in hot climates. In the last campaign it was decided that, for various reasons, khakee cotton was the best material for hot climates. Since he had been at the War Office he had looked into the question himself, because he confessed he had a strong prejudice in favour of serge instead of cotton. He found that the General Commanding in Egypt and the principal medical officers united in preferring khakee cotton to any other form of material for hot climates, provided that it was worn over flannel. He was not, however, quite satisfied, and should be glad, if it were possible, to make some further trials of khakee serge.

SIR FREDERICK FITZ-WYGRAM said, he was glad to hear, and he was sure the great body of the officers of the Army would be pleased to find, that it was not intended to give up the old colour of red. It was thoroughly admitted by all military men that the great point was not so much the colour, as the distinction of colour, by which the nationality of an Army was known. He should prefer to see every British soldier wear a red jacket. In war it was absolutely essential that the nationality of each individual soldier should be known at once. The argument against red was that it was more visible than any other colour, and that in these days of proficiency in rifle shooting it was not advisable to make their men more conspicuous targets than they need be. He believed there was a great fallacy in that argument. When a line was advancing at 1,000 yards it was always in skirmishing order, and he thought that however much men were practised in musketry they would shoot at the advancing line and not at any individual. As the line got nearer, of course the men were drawn closer together; when it got to within 600 yards it was so near as to be immaterial whether the colour was red or khakee or any other. For that reason he thought they might safely adhere to red. Now, with regard to the question of serge or cotton. He had been in India a good many years, and he had found that the principal advantage of cotton over serge was that it could be washed as often as was desired. In hot climates men perspired a good deal, and serge would not stand the constant washing which British soldiers required of it. He had always worn serge; but for the reason he had assigned he thought cotton cloth answered better for the private soldier.

Vote *agreed to.*

(3.) £2,227.800, Supply, Manufacture, and Repair of Warlike Stores.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH): I think it is desirable that I should on this Vote make a statement which my Predecessor (the Marquess of Hartington) promised, in answer to a Question I put to him at an early period of the Session, to make. It is a statement of the expenditure out of the ordinary Estimates, and out of the Vote of Credit for naval armaments, land service armaments, and submarine mine defences. In the early part of the present year an inquiry by a specially qualified Committee was held into the present service method of gun construction. Mr. Leese, of Sir Joseph Whitworth's, Sir William Armstrong, and Captain Noble were added for this purpose to the Ordnance Committee. I have already laid the recommendations of this Committee on the Table of the House, and it will therefore be sufficient at this time to say that the decision of the Committee was wholly favourable to the present method of construction, their recommendations being directed to certain modifications in the designs calculated to give the guns a larger margin of strength to meet the effects of the slow-burning powders now being introduced. The construction of guns suffered a slight delay pending the result of this inquiry; but it is gratifying to be able to state that a more serious cause of delay which threatened difficulty last year has been entirely removed. Mention has formerly been made of the difficulty of obtaining from the trade large steel ingots for the manufacture of heavy guns. There has been no cessation of effort to cope with this difficulty, which may now be said to have been finally overcome. Excluding Elswick, there are now several firms able to supply the Department. The steel forgings up to the end of 1884-5 have all been received, and no difficulty whatever is anticipated in obtaining those which will be required in the present financial year. All guns ordered for the Navy, up to March 31, 1886, will be ready in time for the ships. The ordinary programme of guns for the Navy includes the completion of three 110-ton breech-loading guns and the manufacture of the following—namely, three 13·5 inch of 66 tons, two 12 inch of 48 tons, five 9·2 inch of 22 tons, 102 6 inch of four tons, 43 5-inch of 40 cwt., 40 4 inch of 25 cwt. The Vote of Credit supplies £50,000 for accelerating naval guns, and also money for the manufacture of 100 additional 5-inch guns and other minor gun services. Forgings have also been ordered on account of the programme of 1886-7, and the contract is out for four 66-ton guns for Her Majesty's ship *Howe.* The total number of breech-loading guns made or making up to March 31, 1886, will be—three 16·25 inch 110 tons; 12 13·5 inch 63 or 66 tons, 17 12 inch 43 or 48 tons, 31 9·2 inch 18 or 22 tons, 41 8 inch 11 tons, 363 6 inch 89 or 100 cwt., 367 5 inch 36 or 40 cwt., 141 4 inch 22 or 25 cwt.—making a total of 975 breech-loading guns. With regard to machine and quick-firing guns, 400 of different sorts are being prepared on the normal Estimate, and 460 more are ordered under the Vote of Credit. The amount to be spent on the combined Votes, and including machine-gun ammunition, will be £350,000. One hundred and fifty Whitehead torpedoes will be made this year on the ordinary Estimate, and provision is made in the Vote of Credit for buildings and machinery to increase the power of manufacture to 250 per annum. The total expenditure on naval armaments may be classified as follows:—guns, projectiles, &c., normal Vote £668,000, Vote of Credit £450,000; torpedoes—normal Vote £78,000, Vote of Credit £67,000; miscellaneous—normal Vote £104,000, Vote of Credit £50,000; total—normal Vote £850,000, Vote of Credit £567,000, or a total on both Votes of £1,417,000. The ordinary Estimate for land service armaments (including coaling stations) embraces the following guns and mountings:—two 12 inch breech-loaders, nine 10 inch breech-loaders, 16 9·2 inch breech-loaders, seven 6 inch breech-loaders, besides a certain number of regulation muzzle-loading mountings, the guns being already available, and six 12 inch breech-loading mountings. A sum of £25,000 is taken for four batteries of new Field Artillery 12-pounder breech-loaders. The Vote of Credit includes the special purchase of four 8 inch breech-loading guns, and of seven 6 inch breech-loading guns on disappearing carriages from Sir William Armstrong and Company. The great majority of these guns are for coaling stations abroad. Works have already been commenced or their construction ordered at the principal coaling stations—*i.e.*, Aden, Hong Kong, Jamaica, Simon's Bay, Singapore, Trincomalee—and armaments are in course of manufacture. It is proposed to complete the fortifications of these stations, and of the other principal coaling stations, before dealing with the coaling stations of minor importance. I do not think it would be to the advantage of the public to give the precise details applicable to each station. On this point it will be sufficient for me to say that the works and armaments have been recommended for approval by the authorities who professionally advise the Secretary of State on these matters. Every effort will be made to complete the whole of the fortifications in the time specified—*i.e.*, March 31, 1888. In the meantime, some temporary additions have been made to the armaments at certain stations. The stations at which expenditure has been authorized are Aden, Jamaica, St. Lucia, Simon's Bay, Trincomalee, Hong Kong, St. Helena, Sierra Leone, Singapore, and Mauritius. The main difficulty in providing an efficient system of coast defence by submarine mines is in the organization of the *personnel* to work them. Stores, buildings, and boats are easily procured if funds are available; but a properly trained corps requires time to organize. It is quite out of the question to expect that the Royal Engineers can provide sufficient men for the mine defence of our numerous ports at home and abroad. The cost of such an organization would be prohibitory, and its establishment would prevent the development of local resources which offer to the regular Services assistance of a most valuable and economical character. It has accordingly been decided to form one division of a coast corps of Royal Engineers for instructional purposes in relation to the submarine mine defence of our commercial ports, and to form in connection with this corps Volunteer Submarine Mining Companies. This system has already been successfully tested by the help of Colonel Palmer, M.P., of the 1st Newcastle and Durham Engineer Volunteers; and it has consequently been decided to form four Volunteer Companies (as an increase to the establishment of the regiments) for the defence of the Tyne, Mersey, Clyde, and Severn—for the Tyne, the 1st Newcastle and Durham Engineer Volunteers; for the Mersey, the 1st Lancashire Engineer Volunteers; for the Clyde, the 1st Lanarkshire Engineer Volunteers; and for the Severn, the 1st Gloucestershire Engineer Volunteers. Detachments of these companies have been sent to Chatham for instruction for a period of 30 days. The officers and non-commissioned officers will be sent for instruction for a period of from 60 to 120 days, receiving the usual allowances. A special efficiency capitation grant of £5, in lieu of the ordinary allowance, will be issued to the company on account of such members as shall be recommended for the same. For each company of Volunteers a special instructor will be furnished by the coast corps of Engineers. It will be seen that this system is capable of expansion. For submarine mine defence the following organization has been approved:—For our military ports at home and abroad there will be 10 companies of Royal Engineers, and four companies of Submarine Mining Militia. In commercial ports there will be the nucleus of expansive organization—*i.e.*, one division of the coast corps of the Royal Engineers, and four companies of the Volunteer Engineers. In the coaling stations we have provided one battalion of four companies, to be composed of Malays and other Oriental races, for Hong Kong, Singapore, Trincomalee, Mauritius, and 43 officers and men of the Royal Engineers. Considerable progress has been made in providing stores and depôt buildings for the military ports abroad, and at home efforts are being made to bring them into a condition of preparedness for any emergency that may occur. The principal coaling stations capable of receiving this system of submarine defence are nearly complete as to stores and depôt buildings, while the *personnel* is in course of organization. So far, I have given the results of the expenditure on the ordinary Estimates; but a further sum has been taken on the Vote of Credit for the provision of buildings and stores for submarine defence. This has been mainly expended on the provision of buildings, stores, and boats for the principal commercial harbours, including a small additional amount for coaling stations, and a sum of £20,000 to supplement the defences of the military ports. Taking the two Votes together—*i.e.*, the normal Vote and the Vote of Credit—the expenditure on submarine mine defence will be as follows:—Buildings, £73,000; labour at certain home ports, £7,000; stores, £116,000; vessels, £52,000; total, £248,000.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: How much of that money will be spent in Ireland?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH): I am not able at this moment to give the precise amount; but I will endeavour to give the hon. Gentleman the information subsequently. I propose to follow up the inquiries and proposals of the several Committees which have sat on the defences of the mercantile ports and the arrangements which I have already detailed for the utilization of the Royal Engineers and Engineer Volunteers in the several rivers and ports of the United Kingdom by nominating, in conjunction with my noble Friend the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton), an officer or officers to prepare a working scheme for each place, by which all the several elements shall be brought into harmonious co-operation, and the defences be made capable of immediate application on any sudden emergency. At the present moment, no one man is responsible for their completeness; and in availing ourselves of the loyal devotedness and energy of Naval and of Engineer Volunteers, it will be necessary to provide for them skilled and responsible direction and assistance from the Regular Forces. I think it right, also, that the Government should take Parliament and the country into their confidence as to the amount of exertion and the expenditure which will be required in the course of the next three or four years in order to provide the *matériel* for the protection of our coaling stations, the improved defences of the military ports, and the protection of our rivers and harbours at home, which have been found to be necessary. In December last the Earl of Northbrook stated that it was the intention of the Government to ask, in the three years beginning with 1885-6, for an increased provision for the Navy, amounting to £1,600,000, and £825,000 for armaments and works for the protection of coaling stations. Allusion also was then made to a further provision which would be required for the protection of military ports and mercantile harbours; and subsequently, on introducing his Budget, the late Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers) referred to a probable large expenditure in future years for these purposes. I think it would be right the Committee should know what has already been provided out of the Votes of Parliament, including the Vote of Credit, and the amount which will have to be included in the Estimates of the next four years, if the proposals which have been accepted and approved by the late Government are carried out. I have already said that the Navy and coaling stations required a sum of £2,425,000 in three years. The Estimate for armament and works for the military ports is £2,230,000, and for the mercantile ports £1,770,000; making a total of £6,425,000. Of this £6,425,000, £900,000 has been met out of the Estimates of this year and the Vote of Credit, leaving an abnormal expenditure of £5,525,000 to be provided on Army Estimates within the next four or five years, and in addition a sum of something more than £250,000 would be required to complete the reserve of stores commenced in the Estimates for the present year. This is altogether irrespective of any expenditure for a new small arm which has been under consideration for some years, but as to which no decision has yet been taken. I have thought it right, Sir Arthur Otway, to put the Committee and the country in possession of these facts in order that they may fully and properly understand the Vote which is now under consideration, a Vote which I trust will be accepted as the first and necessary step towards the provision which is required for the safety of the country.

Mr. O'KELLY said, the statement which the right hon. Gentleman had just made was, from an Irish point of view, exceedingly unsatisfactory. The right hon. Gentleman, acting on behalf of the Government, showed a great desire to protect the foreign coaling stations; but he made no provision to protect the Irish towns which were also exposed to attack. In case of war—the only case in which the protection of the coaling stations would become a pressing necessity—nearly all the Irish towns would be practically undefended; and, so far as he gathered, no steps were to be taken to put them in a state of defence. The proposition which the right hon. Gentleman had made with regard to the establishment of a Volunteer Engineer Corps for the defence of towns would be peculiarly applicable to a great many of the Irish towns. Take, for instance, Waterford, Cork, Dublin, Derry and Belfast. Those were towns which, from their situation, could be defended with some chance of success by Volunteer Corps, especially if they used torpedoes. It was very desirable, from an Irish point of view, that the Government should take into serious consideration the desirability of placing Ireland in an equal position as regarded defence as England and the outlying Colonies. The Irish towns were just as important to the Irish people as the English towns were to the English people. The Irish people had to contribute to the defences of the Empire, and therefore they had a right to claim that they should be put upon a footing which would enable them in case of war to protect themselves. At present, Derry, Belfast, Galway, Limerick, and Dublin were completely open to attack. There were no fortifications at any of those towns that could resist a single modern ship of war for an hour. Again, in Ireland there were no Volunteers. The proposition that was now making was that corps should be established in England to act with the Regular Army in the defence of the ports. He could not understand why the men of Ireland should be prevented from joining in such a Volunteer movement. It would not be a very extensive movement, being one confined simply to the defence of ports. That his countrymen should be allowed to form those corps was all he asked for the moment. Whether the English would allow the Irish to arm, as they were arming themselves, was a wider question. He certainly could not see why the Government should refuse them the power of organizing Engineer Volunteers for the defence of their ports. The establishment of such corps could not possibly endanger the connection between the two countries. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith), or some other Member of the Government, would give an undertaking that the interests of Ireland would not be neglected in this matter, at least, of the defence of the ports.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT quite agreed with the hon. Gentleman (Mr. O'Kelly) that as much attention should be paid to the defence of the Irish towns as to the English towns; indeed, he firmly believed his right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith) had got the Irish towns in view just as much as any other towns. Of course, as the hon. Gentleman (Mr. O'Kelly) had said, the arming of Volunteers in Ireland was a wider and different question, and could never be done in a hurry, but required most careful and anxious consideration. The formation of corps for engineer and torpedo service was another question altogether, to which he was sure the right hon. Gentleman would give his serious consideration. He congratulated his right hon. Friend upon the statement which he had just made, because it was not only a very statesmanlike statement, but it showed that he had carefully considered the great need of the country in regard to defences. The right hon. Gentleman was not only prepared to improve the defences of the home country, and there was no doubt they were greatly in need of improvement; but he was determined that their coaling stations abroad, which were now more exposed than others, should be armed and fortified in a manner which was absolutely necessary for their safety. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that a sum of £6,425,000 would be necessary to carry out the works proposed, and that it was intended to spread the raising of that amount over several years. He (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) was persuaded that the nation was now fully alive to the necessity of improved defences, and for the expenditure which was now proposed. It was not for him to say how it was to be carried out; but he was satisfied that now the attention of the country had been called to these matters it would never forgive any Government that neglected to carry out its wishes, and he was sure that any Government, in following the national will, would be studying the best interests of the country. With reference to heavy ordnance, the right hon. Gentleman had stated that a very large number of breech-loading guns were required for the Navy; and he wished to ask whether, considering the great outlay that was to be made, and the great number of guns which were to be made both for the Army and the Navy, the time had not come when those two Departments should be separated, and when the Navy should manufacture its own guns? It would appear that the result of the present system must necessarily be that one Department would keep all the best of the guns for itself. He would say nothing as to that, however; but it would be well for the Government to consider whether the time had not now come when some change should be made. At the end of his right hon. Friend's speech he stated that there were a certain number of Field Artillery batteries which had got new 12-pounder breech-loading guns—he stated that there would be seven batteries of those guns completed by the end of the year. Now, he should like to know from his hon. Friend the Surveyor General of the Ordnance (Mr. Guy Dawnay), when he got up, what he thought of that gun. He had heard that this was the best gun in the world, and he would like to hear on whose authority that was stated. He could only say that in this country their artillery ought to be supplied with the very best gun procurable; and if this one was the best, he hoped that all their Horse Artillery would be supplied with it at once. There was another point which had been mentioned in regard to the military rifle, and upon which he should like to say a word. The right hon. Gentleman said that there was nothing needed in regard to a new rifle. He understood that there was a new rifle—or rather an improvement on the Martini-Henry—and he should like to know whether this new Martini-Henry, with its improvements, was to be the new rifle; and, if so, whether anything had been done to test the value of the new improvements? If it was the intention to issue the old Martini with improvements, he should be glad to hear whether the spiral spring in the locks would continue to be used. He was always opposed to the spiral spring. No other rifle had it, and it was not used in any of the old rifles. He was desirous of knowing whether anything had been done or not in this matter. If the hon. Gentleman said that nothing was settled, and that they were to have no new rifle at present, he would remain satisfied, and would have no further questions to ask. There was just one other matter which he wished to call attention to. On the Public Accounts Committee they had had a question raised several times in regard to the valuation of stores, and especially of the stores at Woolwich and elsewhere. In the Report rendered to the Accounts Committee he found that they had charges of this kind—"Accoutrements, Pioneers' Appliances, and Tools, £254,708;" "Small Arms and Armourers' Tools, £1,770,105;" "Camp and Field Equipment and Intrenching and Earth-boring Tools, £684,199." Now, he should like to know what use such statements as those were? They told them nothing. They told them absolutely nothing as to the number and description of rifles or other things that they had in store. Then there was another item—"Ordnance and Ordnance Tools, £7,994,602." Now, he would like particularly to call the attention of the Surveyor General of Ordnance to that item. What on earth could anyone find out from it? Nobody knew what guns they had in store, what condition they were in, or whether they were of light calibre or not. What he wanted to know was, whether anything had been done in reference to the suggestions which had been made by the Public Accounts Committee? And he wished particularly to call attention to four paragraphs they had inserted in their Report on the 15th of July, 1885, as follows:—

"Paragraph 86. Your Committee observe that an estimate of the value of stores in reserve depôts has been given on page 176 of the Army Appropriation Account submitted to them. This statement is not in itself sufficient, and, although forming the foundation of a store audit, has not been checked or examined by the Comptroller and Auditor General.

"Paragraph 87. Many points arise with respect to the store audit; for instance, the market value, the quantity, the quality, and the adaptability for present requirements of the stores under examination; and this point should not be lost sight of, even although in each particular a full investigation and Report may be difficult.

"Paragraph 88. Your Committee would suggest that the quantities of the particular articles in store should be specified, especially as regards ordnance, rifles, and other important stores.

"Paragraph 89. Your Committee are glad to observe that so far steps have been taken to meet the views expressed in paragraphs 128 to 133 of the Report of the Public Accounts Committee, 1884. It is to be hoped that some more rapid progress may be made with regard to this important question."

Now, he hoped the attention of his right hon. Friend would be given to this point. It was suggested that there might be some good reason for the amounts of the stores not being put down—some political reason why they should not let Foreign Governments know. But he would venture to say that what foreigners wanted to know was not how much powder we had, or how many rifles we had, but how many men we could put in the field. There was no reason why the House should not know how many rifles and how much powder they had in store, so that hon. Members might come down there and see that each successive Government did its duty in keeping up those stores. It was because he was so anxious that those stores should be kept up, and because he believed that a Return of the amounts would do no harm, that he had urged the matter so earnestly that night.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR said, the statement of the Secretary of State for War was a most interesting one, and he congratulated the right hon. Gentleman upon it. There was one particular point which had for many years attracted his attention, and that was with regard to the armament for the Navy. Now, a great part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech was connected with the guns for the Navy, and it seemed to him to be an extraordinary thing that the Secretary of State for War should have to make such a statement in regard to an article of such great importance to another Department. He decidedly objected to one Department being responsible for another on matters of this sort, and thought it would be for the advantage of both Services that the orders for the manufacture of the guns for the Army and Navy should be distinct and be issued by the respective Heads. Another matter which he wished to call attention to was this—that although the right hon. Gentleman had made a general statement of the financial requirements, he had not stated what was the actual amount which was necessary for supplying the armament, ammunition, and stores of the Navy, as apart from the Army; and at present no one could possibly understand what the expenses of the different Departments of the Army were, when all the Estimates for guns, projectiles, and gunpowder were lumped together. He thought it was a great political mistake to allow the Admiralty to shirk the responsibility of being obliged to admit that they had not sufficient guns for the Naval Service. He believed that the present Secretary of State for War was partly converted to his way of thinking, if he could judge from observations which had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman while he was in Opposition. If his suggestion were adopted, each Department—Army and Admiralty—would take the money it wanted for material of all kind, and the House would then have direct control over each Department interested, and thereby enforce the responsibility on the responsible Heads for thorough efficiency; but the present system of producing the Estimates, whereby the Army bore the cost of the Naval armament, was of no use whatever. The War Office would, by the change, be relieved of a great deal of trouble and anxiety, and would be enabled to do their own work much more efficiently than they did at present. He made this appeal very earnestly, because he believed the present Secretary of State for War was nearly convinced of the soundness of the proposed change, and that if he went into the question thoroughly he would come to the conclusion which he (Sir George Balfour) had been advocating for all the years he had been in Parliament.

CAPTAIN AYLMER only wanted to put one or two questions which, no doubt, his hon. Friend the Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Guy Dawnay) would be able to answer. He had heard with considerable pleasure of the intention to form a Volunteer Engineer Force for the defence of their harbours, and he thought that they might be well applied also in Ireland. He noticed with regret that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War had not mentioned Cyprus among the coaling stations for which provision was to be made. Now, he held that Cyprus was one of their most important ports, and a great centre of operations; and he earnestly hoped that the Government would take the earliest possible opportunity of providing for the protection of that most valuable coaling station. He hoped the hon. Gentleman the Surveyor General of Ordnance would bring before the Secretary of State for War his opinion, for whatever it was worth, that protection should be given to the coaling station at Cyprus. His hon. and gallant Friend the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) had strongly recommended that the ordnance for the Army and the Navy should be manufactured in separate Departments. Well, he was entirely opposed to that. He had, perhaps, as much experience in these matters as anyone in that House, and he was entirely of opinion that the efficiency of their armaments was due to the fact that they were all manufactured under one Head at Woolwich; and he earnestly trusted that no new arrangement would be made. Faults had been found with the Martini-Henry, and much had been said respecting a new rifle which the late Government had in contemplation. He hoped, however, that that view had been dropped by the present Government, because he believed that the faults found with the Martini-Henry were of a very trivial character; and although, of course, every patentee thought his own weapon the best, the improvements in the new rifle were not of sufficient value to justify a change throughout the Service. It was true that objections had been raised to the Martini-Henry ammunition and to the sticking of the cartridges; but that also, he held, could be easily remedied by a better manufacture of cartridges. In all other respects the Martini-Henry was a good, sound, serviceable weapon. With regard to the spiral spring in the lock, he might say that, before the Committee who had recommended the Martini-Henry 14 years ago, that spring had been put to more tests than almost any other piece of machinery existing before they finally adopted it. The question had arisen as to whether a magazine rifle would not be more suitable for the mounted portions of their Service especially, instead of the ordinary breech-loading rifles. For his part, he thought the experiment was worth a trial. They had not so many men as other countries, and they ought to provide them with the very best possible weapons in order to enable them to do as much execution as they could. Another question was the use of the revolver, practice with which he was exceedingly glad to see was just being promoted at Wimbledon. It was a useful weapon, and he hoped that, having shown its wonderful capabilities at Wimbledon, it would be served out pretty generally in the Army. It might in the first instance be served out to Staff sergeants, as an experiment, or some other steps might be taken to make its use more general.

THE SURVEYOR GENERAL OF ORDNANCE (Mr. GUY DAWNAY) said, this was a very important Vote, and many important questions had been raised—questions in which he himself had always taken a very great interest. He was sorry he could not go very fully into them at present; but he desired the Committee to believe that he would deal with them in a more careful and deliberate manner when the occasion came for action. A most important question had been raised with regard to the formation of a Volunteer Engineer Force for the defence of Ireland; but he could only say on that point that the matter should receive the very fullest attention and consideration of the Government. There was another question to which he hoped to be able to give proper attention, and which was a question which struck one at once in considering this particular Vote in the Estimates—that was making the Army Estimates responsible for Naval armaments. It certainly did seem to be an anomaly, and an anomaly that it was difficult to justify; and he could not help admitting that it would be better that the Admiralty should be responsible for, and should supply themselves with, their own armaments. [Captain AYLMER: It is only a question of accounts.] The hon. and gallant Gentleman behind him said it was only a question of accounts; but, in his opinion, it had unfortunately been treated too long as merely a matter of accounts. The hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) had made some reference to the new 12-pounder breech-loading gun, and asked that he should state what had been done with regard to it. Well, he believed that he was expressing the unhesitating opinion of all their Artillery officers—and he thought no one in that House would contradict him when he asserted that British Artillery officers were the best in the world—when he said that the new 12-pounder, of which they would have seven batteries ready at the end of the year, was the best field gun ever manufactured. Some batteries, as he said, would be ready by the end of the financial year, and if the money was forthcoming they could provide 11 batteries, or even more, of what was undoubtedly the most powerful field artillery in the world. As regarded the Martini-Henry rifle, it had on many a well-fought field proved itself an excellent weapon, and one which was better than any weapon he had seen in use in Foreign Services. At the same time, he did not think it was incapable of improvement, and the War Office were, at the present moment, considering an improved rifle. The hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex had asked for details as to the improvement; but he could not go into all the particulars. He might say, however, that the action was the same as the Martini-Henry, and it had the same spiral spring in the lock. He knew the objection to a spiral spring; but, as a matter of fact, it had proved no disadvantage in the case of the Martini-Henry. The new rifle was provided with a stock so made as to obviate the inconvenience of the heating of the barrel. The bore was smaller than in the old rifle, and the bullet much lighter, weighing 385 grains instead of 480, but as the cartridge contained the same quantity of powder as the present pattern of cartridge, this meant an enormous increase of velocity, and a far flatter trajectory at the nearer distance, while it had been found to make excellent shooting also at the long ranges. His hon. and gallant Friend (Captain Aylmer) had asked him if he had given his attention to the magazine rifle, and he might say that it was a question to which he had paid a great deal of attention; but his view was against the adoption of the magazine rifle, at any rate, in the general Service. It might be useful in some branches of the Service, and, no doubt, would be so to the Navy; but until they had some better means of transporting ammunition in the field, it would be useless to give their men magazine rifles. If they could get rid of the smoke made by the powder—if they could get a smokeless powder—then, he thought, they might be able to adopt the magazine rifle. He thought he might say, however, that there was no sort of magazine rifle yet invented which was really efficient. They were very pretty weapons some of them, and might act well enough for sporting purposes; but there was no pattern yet which would be useful as a weapon for general service in the field. With regard to the revolver, he considered that if they could teach their Cavalry to use it, it would be one of the very best offensive weapons in the world. No one could think more highly of it as a weapon than he did; but those who had tried it admitted that it was the most difficult weapon in the world to use, and he thought, therefore, that everybody would agree with him that, until they had proved more successful in teaching their men to use the rifle properly, it would be useless to arm them with revolvers. He regretted that the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) was not now in his place. He had raised a very important question with regard to the amount of stores, and had asked that details might be given as to the amount of stores which the country possessed. That subject had received the serious attention of preceding Governments; but he was not at all sure that the policy of allowing the public entirely behind the scenes in this matter was advisable. He thought the public had a perfect right, however, to know that the equipment of the First Army Corps was always ready, and he thought he might go further even in this direction. He considered that a Committee might be allowed to settle on a certain reserve of stores, below which they should never be allowed to drop, and that the existence of such a minimum reserve might be publicly certified; but he was not prepared to say that the nation would be the gainer in the end by the general publication abroad of the actual amount of all these reserve stores. The Secretary of State for War was in favour of publicity, as far as possible, in regard to public expenditure, and as far as the information was conducive to the interests of the nation it would be given.

MR. BRAND said, it seemed to him, at the time the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite was making his statement, as if it had been suddenly discovered that certain stores were insufficient. He was able to say, however, that that was not so. There was one question referred to by the hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) which was of great importance. He had strongly advocated that the value of stores should be published every year, and that the House should be informed of the number of rifles, cartridges, &c., in reserve; but, for his part, he thought there would be very great political objection to that course. It amounted to this—that the hon. and gallant Gentleman would relieve the Secretary of State of a great deal of that responsibility which properly devolved upon him. This demand on the part of the hon. and gallant Member was really one to take the Executive duty of keeping up the reserve stores out of the hands of the Secretary of State and place it in those of the House of Commons. With respect to the valuation of stores, which his hon. and gallant Friend proposed, together with the actual price of every set of articles, should be kept from year to year, he believed it would be utterly impossible for any such account to be kept. It would require an enormous establishment, and it would be absolutely necessary to have a very large number of officials to carry out such a process. His hon. and gallant Friend also said that the responsibility for naval armaments should be cast on the Admiralty, and that the cost of such armaments should be shown on the Naval Votes. In his opinion, such a change would be of very great advantage. He had listened to the speech of the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton), and he understood him to say that there would be a great difficulty in this, inasmuch as such a change would necessitate a double Arsenal. He (Mr. Brand), however, did not believe that it would necessitate anything of the kind; his opinion was that such a change could be made, and that the Admiralty might treat the War Office just as it treated the contractors with whom it dealt. He could not help thinking that the advantage of that would be very great. Of course, the statement that had been made by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) was extremely satisfactory to him, because it was really the programme of the late Government, both as regarded armaments, submarine stores, and fortifications. But there was one point which he thought wanted some elucidation. He thought there had been a great deal of what he might call rather wild talk about the defences of the Empire. At a recent meeting in London he noticed that the Mayor of Brighton complained that Brighton was entirely defenceless, at which there were cries of "Shame!" That was an instance of some of the speeches that were being made at the present time. But what would be the cost of defending a place like Brighton? He should say it would not be less than £500,000. But if they were to defend Brighton, why not place in security other towns in the Kingdom, and where were they to draw the line? Leaving out the coaling stations for which provision had been made in this year's Estimates, he thought it right to settle this principle in order to obviate any undue expectations. The question they had to deal with was this—what were the ports of this country the defence of which should be considered of national importance, and what was the cost at which they would be willing to defend those ports? He believed that everyone would agree that the great Naval Dockyards at Portsmouth, Plymouth, Sheerness, Chatham, Devonport, and Woolwich were places the defence of which was of national importance, and that their power of self-defence might be immensely strengthened. The same might be said of the fortresses of Gibraltar, Malta, and Bermuda. He did not mean to say that those fortified places would not in their present condition be able to give a good account of themselves if attacked; but it seemed to him that those fortified places were not fully up to the requirements of the time, and the question was now, seeing that such an advance had been made in the armaments of the country, whether the time had not come when they ought to revise and complete the armaments of those fortresses. Now, with regard to commercial harbours, he wished to say that he looked upon them as being placed in a different category altogether; and, so far as they were concerned, it would be necessary to settle the principle on which it was proposed to act. The question was, which of those commercial ports were to be defended, and at what expense? In his opinion there were only three which, as being ports of immense wealth, and the defence of which was of national importance, should be defended —namely, the Tyne and the Clyde, because they were ports at which ships might be built and fitted out, and also the Mersey, because Liverpool was a great emporium of trade. There was this further advantage with respect to those ports, that they offered in themselves great facilities for defence, which might consequently be carried out at a very moderate expenditure of money. But when he turned to other ports in the Kingdom, he said they were not such of which it could be said that their defence was of great national importance; and that if those towns wished for a defence against bombardment, as an insurance against war risk, they should undertake the cost themselves, and that the duty of the State should be confined to advancing capital to them to be repaid. Then there was another part of the right hon. Gentleman's statement to which he would refer. The right hon. Gentleman had dealt with the progress in naval armaments. There was no question in the days of the late Government which had caused more anxiety than that of naval armaments. He would urge now what he had urged before—namely, that if there had been any delay in providing the Navy with breech-loading guns the mischief was done long before the late Government took Office, and that the late Government did all that was possible to do in pushing on the naval armaments of the country. The facts were perfectly clear with regard to that. Up to 1875 this country was in as good a position as any other with respect to naval armaments. At that time the old breech-loading guns of Continental nations were as obsolete as our old breech-loading guns. After 1875 there came a period of stagnation. He did not blame the Government of the day; but he believed the real truth of the matter was that the advice of professional experts, both military and naval, was distinctly against a change in construction, and that there was hesitation in adopting a breech-loading armament when other nations were adopting it. His belief was that delay was, in a great measure, occasioned by the manner in which Government after Government had encouraged Government manufacture as against private trade. He knew all the arguments that could be adduced in favour of Government manufacture—he would not then state them; but he believed that the advantages of having a private trade which could be rapidly extended, and which would develop the genius of the country, would be of greater advantage than any saving which might be effected by the State in using only State manufacture. He thought the delay arose from the fact that there was a large and costly plant at Woolwich employed in the manufacture of guns, and that there was a prejudice in the minds of the authorities against replacing that plant for the construction of new breech-loading guns. He could say that in 1880, when the late Government took Office, there was not a single breech-loading gun in existence; and the change then made in a few months was not only from muzzle-loading to breech-loading, but from wrought iron to steel. That was plainly stated by the late Secretary of State for War, who said that—

> "With regard to the supply of heavy guns for the Navy, fair progress has been made in the present year. During the present and the past two years we have been undergoing a double transition; first, from the muzzle-loader to the breech-loader; and, in the next place, in the material, from wrought iron to steel."—(3 *Hansard*, [286] 119.)

Well, that was the point he wished to urge on the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War. The late Government had had to contend with great difficulty with regard to patterns and with regard to designs and forgings. They had adopted the policy of encouraging the private trade of the country, and they decided to obtain the heaviest steel forgings from the trade in Sheffield and Manchester. After a considerable period of time they arrived at success in that matter, and there were at that moment four or five firms supplying the Government. When he was at the War Office he informed those firms that if they would put up the expensive plant necessary they would be supported by the Government, and that Government would give them orders for the forgings for the purpose of carrying out these measures. They had done so, and he was sure that the right hon. Gentleman would agree with him that it was necessary to keep the promises made to those firms; and he thought, if necessary, it would be wise to limit the work at Woolwich rather than not keep faith with them. He had only to add that he considered the matter one of great importance, and the main object he had in making these remarks was to urge the right hon. Gentleman to follow the lines adopted by the late Government.

COLONEL NOLAN remarked, that the late Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Brand) had argued that the whole responsibility of the Department should rest with the Secretary of State for War. He had read some Returns showing that there were about 400,000 Martini-Henry rifles in store; but immediately after that he read an article in a scientific magazine, laying it down as a principle that there ought to be 2,000,000 rifles in store. How could the Secretary of State for War be responsible for such a number of weapons? There was, of course, a great discrepancy between the two statements; but if the authorities kept the matter in the dark till the last moment, and then said they had always the Secretary of State for War to fall back upon, he thought that the country was likely to suffer in time of need from the want of rifles. For his own part, he could see no real argument against publicity in the matter of stores. When the public knew how many rifles were in existence, those who were competent to speak on the subject would be able to give advice. He did not think that any Foreign Government would have much trouble in finding out how many arms there were; there would be very little in finding out how many there were in the Tower. The authorities only succeeded in keeping the people of the country in ignorance, while every Foreign War Office knew exactly the position we were in. Our position with regard to torpedoes was kept secret for a little time; but it was now known to every Foreign Government. The same remarks would apply to the publication of drill books. On the whole, he thought the argument was entirely in favour of the hon. and gallant Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot); and he thought the matter was one with regard to which Ministers should not pay too much attention to the advice they got from their own officers. With regard to the question of breech-loading guns, it seemed to him that neither the late nor the present Surveyor General of Ordnance had said much to show that the armament in that respect was in a satisfactory state; they had confined themselves to saying whose fault it was that there had been delay between 1874 and the time when the late Administration came into Office. He had seen the breech-loading guns of Germany and Russia, which were always long. But the great difficulty was, when the change was made from muzzle-loading to breech-loading guns, there were so many subsidiary changes to be made in respect to carriages and other matters, even the ships themselves—everything had to be changed. He thought that foreign countries were in advance of us in promoting the efficiency of their guns. He thought the Government would be liable to be twitted on every hand if they went more than was necessary outside the Government Departments, for it would be said that they were giving their orders and encouraging the large private establishments for political purposes, because the probabilities were that it would secure the votes of the men employed on the Government orders. He looked on it, he would not say as the worst, but as a most dangerous plan to get private manufacturers to build extensive plant for the purpose of manufacturing for the Government, and then to feel bound to give such private manufacturers large orders. It was said by the Woolwich people that the Government had spent so much money on plant for muzzle-loading that it was ridiculous to allow it to remain idle and useless. Though that might be very near the truth, it was not quite the truth. He did not think there was as much plant required for the manufacture of breech-loading guns as for muzzle-loading guns. He did not believe that boring machinery, turning machinery, hammers, and so forth, however, would have to be very materially altered. One great reason why the officials in the Government factories desired to have an increased amount of work was the feeling of *esprit de corps* which existed amongst them. There was not an officer employed who ever made 1*s.* out of the matter, and yet they were all almost as keen in wishing to have large orders given to their Departments as were the private manufacturers. Those large orders meant additional comfort to the workmen, for they had more to do and more pay, and, consequently, more comforts. They were all, in fact, ready and willing to work. The officers were not pecuniarily interested, and yet they were as anxious to receive a large order as were the managers of private firms who made £50,000 at a time out of a large order. The experiments for breech-loading carried out by the Government had lasted a long time, and the result of adopting the breech-loading principle would have been that they would have had to put their men on half-time for a long period. They had the patterns for muzzle-loaders, so they had gone on making guns of that description. Now that everything was changed, and while they had muzzle-loaders all over the world, it was to the interest of the working man to turn round and say—"We must make breech-loading guns." The desire to have full work on the breech-loading guns was as strong now as had been the desire to continue the manufacture of muzzle-loaders in the past. Those were the two things which had kept England in a totally different position in regard to those matters from the rest of Europe. Another subject he should like to deal with was not so technical—namely, the establishment of a Naval Volunteer Engineer Corps. His hon. Friend (Mr. O'Kelly) had pointed out how serious it would be if Ireland were not put in the same category as England in those matters. The point was certainly one deserving the careful consideration of the Government and he would commend it to their consideration, because if the English ports were protected by means of mines and torpedoes and the Irish ports were not so protected, the simple result would be that the one class would be protected at the expense of the other. If they were making a new start in the matter of Naval Engineer Volunteering, it was quite time to take seriously into account the necessity of doing something of the kind in Ireland. The Force should be established after the same scale in Ireland as in England.

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER said, he only wished to detain the Committee for one moment by referring to one point in the very interesting Memorandum read to them by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) just now. The Memorandum had been prepared in October last, and the object of it was to instruct the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War as to the lines on which he would be justified in entering on the Estimates the amount to be asked for for the commencement of a plan of coast defence and providing drill sergeants for the local Marine companies. The right hon. Gentleman had said that the *personnel* would be difficult to obtain, and, no doubt, on the first blush, that would appear so. But they must consider the fact that when this system came into operation they would be able to utilize in connection with it the Militia Artillery and Engineers and the Volunteer Artillery and Engineers. The numbers were—Militia Artillery, 19,630 men; Militia Engineers, 1,449; making a total of Militia for this coast defence of 21,079. Then, if they took the whole force of Artillery and Engineer Volunteers—and the right hon. Gentleman would observe, in connection with this corps, as well as in regard to the Militia, that it was a conspicuous fact that every corps only existed in a county that had a seaboard of its own—they would find, Volunteer Artillery, 44,482 men; Volunteer Engineers, 10,723; making a total for the Volunteers of 55,205. To those might be added the 1,200 Naval Volunteers, giving a total force at present of 77,584 men. As he understood, the First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) had announced the other day that he intended to give a capitation grant to the 1,200 Naval Engineers, who would be able to work torpedo boats. When that capitation grant—which would be 30*s*., in all probability—was given the number of the Force would most likely very conspicuously increase. With the exception of the counties of Shropshire and Staffordshire and the City of London the various corps which composed this Force belonged to coast counties. Those men would be able to give service at any moment in defence of their own coasts, having gone through a certain amount of drill; and they would be willing to receive instruction from the Regular sergeants, who would be their drill instructors. He was sure it would only require this plan to be known to be popular, that local subscriptions would flow in, and that in every way local effort would be found to supplement a comprehensive Government plan of coast defence.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, that he—as, no doubt, others had done—had listened with considerable interest to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War; but he imagined that they would be better able to appreciate it and estimate its full value to-morrow than they were to-day, hearing it for the first time. But one thing he could not help noticing—and he had ventured to interrupt the right hon. Gentleman with regard to it—and that was, that though the figures of his statement had amounted to something like £2,250,000, in addition to a sum of £645,000 which, he understood, it was proposed to spend during the next three or four years, not a single 1*d*. of that sum was to be spent in Ireland.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH): I can explain that.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he had not gathered from the right hon. Gentleman's statement that there was any prospect of any part of this being spent in Ireland under present circumstances.

The right hon. Gentleman had been good enough to say that if in Ireland the Government found themselves offered certain assistance they would be very glad to accept it, and that then a portion of the money would be devoted to Ireland —would be made available for expenditure in that country. But in connection with all these Votes—in connection with the present and other Army Votes which had been taken from time to time the course pursued with regard to Ireland had always been the same. There was, some time ago, an immense Vote of £11,000,000 granted for fortifications. Where did that go? Why, to Great Britain. Let them turn to Votes 6 and 10—where did that money go? Why, to the Dockyards of this country. There was not a single Government Dockyard in Ireland; and only a trifling amount was spent there. Then, look to the present Vote; where did the money under it go to—this £2,250,000? To the Royal Arsenal at Woolwich, the Royal Small Arm Factories at Enfield and Birmingham, and the Royal Gunpowder Manufactory. None of it was spent in Ireland. There would, of course, come a day when accounts would have to be settled—it could not be far distant —between Ireland and Great Britain. when it would be necessary to take into account these different Estimates over a long series of years, and when it would be necessary to consider how much had been spent in Ireland in proportion to that which had been drawn from her. He would even now suggest a recast of some of these Estimates, so as to secure for the taxpaying portion of the population something like a fair distribution of their Public Expenditure. Next year the present Government—who, of course, were not responsible for these figures—would have an opportunity of bringing in their own Army Estimates. When they did, he hoped they would see fit to give the people in Ireland something like a fair share of such advantages as resulted from the distribution of public money. They could depend upon it that no such Vote as the present would be passed without considerable resistance. No Votes of this kind, whether Army Votes or Navy Votes, would be passed without most strenuous opposition. There was only one other point he would dwell on, and that was the point raised by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) with regard to the stores. That was a point upon which he had ventured, two or three years ago, to endeavour to attract the attention of the House without, however, meeting with much success. He was glad to say that year after year the matter was becoming more scrutinized, and that the Public Accounts Committee were now devoting attention to it, and were requiring information upon it from the Treasury and the War Office. He was satisfied that in the end, and in the judgment of the House, the matter would not be allowed to continue, and that what the Comptroller and Auditor General had declared to be necessary would be done. Reference had been made to the Report of the Public Accounts Committee of last year. In that Report the Committee said—

> "The Treasury view is clearly set forth in reply to Question 1,249, and with that view we are disposed to generally concur—namely, that an order for stores is important,"

—at present there was no such order at all—

> "and the difficulties connected with it must be fairly faced."

The step that was now being taken was, in their opinion, an important step towards the realization of that object—namely, first of all, a careful examination of the supplies, of the estimates, and of the annual accounts as to the Army stores. When that was done, it would be for the Treasury to judge whether it secured sufficient control over Army stores. They thought that when this was carried out, it would give a good opportunity to the Comptroller and Auditor General to express his views as to what should be done to institute an independent audit of such stores. The Committee went on to say that they considered that in the public interest some evidence should be afforded that the quantities and values of the Army and Navy Stores were properly stated from year to year. That was unquestionably a very important point. If he had understood the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War aright, it was necessary to ask for a sum of no less than £200,000 to make up certain deficiencies in the stores. If the Ministry had not informed the House of that fact the House never could have arrived at it. There had been a depletion of the stores. If the late Government had remained in Office the House generally would have known no more about it than it knew about the excessive expenditure which had occurred in connection with the Navy. The whole thing would have been hushed up. The Comptroller and Auditor General would not have been able to say anything about it, for, as he said, he could not tell whether the authorities did not cover the expenditure by selling old stores. There were acres and acres of land at Woolwich covered with old stores some time ago, and the late Government had not entertained a clear idea as to what they were or what they were worth. But the late Government had been able, after a certain amount of pressure had been put upon them, to furnish what they called a "Valuation Return of Stores;" but that Return was not worth the paper it was written on. It was futile to place before common-sense men figures of that kind, showing that there were stores worth £7,000,000 or £8,000,000. How was that estimate arrived at? No one could state. If it was the regular price of the stores it was worthless, because everyone knew that many of the stores, valuable enough when new, were now worth nothing more than old iron. The figures were simply guess-work, if not something worse, and were put down merely for the sake of covering the deficiency and depletion of the stores. He hoped the Comptroller and Auditor General would get what he had been asking for, and what the sense of the House approved of, and what the Committee of Public Accounts had been asking for over and over again — namely, the quantity of stores in hand. It had been said there would be great danger in letting the Russians, or someone else, know how many rounds of ammunition we had, how many rifles, and so on. But it would not be necessary to give that information. All he would ask was that such a Return should be made for the information of the War Office Authorities. Such a Return should be made the basis of information. At present there was no such Return. There was no Return of the figures which they could submit to the Comptroller and Auditor General in order that he might—confidentially, if they liked—check the stores year by year, to satisfy the House that there had been no undue depletion of military stores. He did not think it necessary to give the Committee of Public Accounts any figures showing the exact quantity of the stores. The Comptroller and Auditor General should have — just as in the case of the Secret Service money—reasonable proof that the money voted by Parliament was applied to the services for which it was granted. If information was given to show that the stores had not been unduly run down, and that they had not economized by running down the stores; then, he thought, every practical purpose would be attained. But to be content with mere Valuation Returns which were, at the best, mere guess-work, was simply to play the fool with the House of Commons. To put such Returns before the Public Accounts Committee was wholly insufficient.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) said, he had listened to the interesting speech of the hon. Member, and could assure him that the suggestions he had made would receive the consideration they deserved. He was not in a position to make any promise as to the mode in which the question should be dealt with, but it should certainly not be lost sight of; and in saying that he, of course, could not bind himself to do more than prudence and the interests of the country would allow. He desired that the Comptroller and Auditor General's Department should have all the information which would enable it to form an accurate judgment as to the requisite appropriation of stores, and as to the stores and the stock actually in existence, and the value of it. Nothing could be more distasteful to those who were principally concerned than the delivery of a mere statement as to the original cost of the stores or of their estimated value, which turned out on inquiry altogether unsatisfactory. In the hon. Gentleman's view it was important to ascertain whether the country really possessed the material which would be required in time of strain, and he could safely say that every Government would feel it to be its duty to see that the stores were maintained in a condition to be able to bear the strain of any emergency which might occur. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Stroud (Mr. Brand) had referred to an observation which he (Mr. W. H. Smith) had made a very short time ago. He thought the hon. Member would do him the credit to say that he had carefully avoided making a charge of any kind whatever against the late Government, or from taking any credit to the present Government—any charge against the late Government for what they had done, or any credit to the present Government for what they had sought to do. He desired, in dealing with this question of national defence, to keep clear of anything which would sound like provocation and from anything which would tend in any degree to excite Party feeling; but when the hon. Gentleman referred to what had been done by the late Government, and had stated that they had found that the breech-loader was not in existence when they came into Office, he thought he might take some credit to himself for the fact that in 1878—only a year or two after the period which the hon. Gentleman had described as the period when the change from muzzle-loading to breech-loading was adopted on the Continent—he had pressed most strongly for the adoption of breech-loaders for the Navy. From that time to the present he had been using all the influence he possessed in Parliament to urge not only on his Colleagues in the last Conservative Government, but also on the late Government—on the Governments of 1874 and 1880—without endeavouring to impart into the discussion anything of a factious character, the necessity and the duty of improving the armaments of their ports and, as a necessary corollary, of improving the armaments of the Army. Well, steps had been taken, and taken vigorously, in that direction during the past year or two. There could be no doubt that the necessity for looking into this question was very great indeed, and he was glad he had been able to state to the House the conclusion the late Government had arrived at. An hon. Gentleman had referred to the steps which had been taken for furnishing ingots of steel for the manufacture of guns. He made no complaint of the hon. Gentleman's desire to secure for the State the great resources which the country possessed for the manufacture of steel. He had urged the desirability of doing something in that direction as strongly as he had been able to do so; but no monopoly could be permitted either to an individual manufacturer or to our arsenals. It was desirable that the country should reap the full advantage of the competition between the two. There must be reasonable expectations of profit held out to persons who were willing to go to the expense of providing extensive plant in competition with each other for the material required. Now that we could form some estimate of the amount of work which would have to be done during the next two or three years, he ventured to express a hope that no delay would be suffered to occur in providing the material. It seemed to him that the interests of the country would be best protected by the provision of the defence which was admitted to be required. After the most careful examination, which had spread over three or four years, and after the decision that the late Government had arrived at, he maintained there was no desire to postpone the completion of the work. If any person entering upon the work realized the necessity of its speedy completion, he would not be led away by the fact that the payment for the work was to be spread over a certain period of time, but he would have the work executed as rapidly and as efficiently as possible. They had at last decided on the kind of gun to be used, and the kind of powder to be used in the gun, and he believed they had nearly arrived at the kind of projectile which was to be used; and it seemed to him that having, after considerable delay and after considerable research, formed an estimate of the expenditure which ought to be incurred, it would be advisable, in the interests of the country, that the expenditure should be made as rapidly, and yet as efficiently, as possible. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Stroud (Mr. Brand) referred to the course the late Government had taken with regard to the protection of mercantile ports, and he laid stress on his assertion that only the mercantile harbours of the Clyde, the Tyne, and the Mersey really needed protection. But that was only the opinion of the hon. Gentleman; it was certainly not the opinion of the hon. Gentleman's Colleagues, including the noble Marquess the late Secretary of State for War (the Marquess of Hartington). The Report which was received and adopted by the late Government, and which was acted upon by the Treasury, recommended that a grant should be made in the course of the present year for the protection of other harbours and rivers besides those enumerated by the hon. Gentleman. He (Mr. W. H. Smith) thought it was the interest and duty of the Government to afford protection to ports like the Humber and Severn. There were ports in Ireland also which required protection, and he was glad to be able to assure the hon. Gentleman the Member for Roscommon (Mr. O'Kelly) that 12 per cent of the expenditure which was contemplated for commercial ports would be incurred on commercial ports on the coast of Ireland. Ireland, therefore, might rest assured that it would receive a portion, at least, of the expenditure. The hon. and gallant Member for Galway (Colonel Nolan) had, in a most interesting speech, given the Committee a great deal of valuable information, and he (Mr. W. H. Smith) would not fail to profit by it. In conclusion, he could only assure the Committee that the policy which it was now sought to carry out was not a Party policy; it was not a policy of the present Government alone, but it was a policy which he believed had the sanction not only of the present Government and of the present House of Commons, but of the country at large.

Vote *agreed to.*

(4.) £843,800, Works, Buildings, &c., at Home and Abroad.

(5.) £128,500, Establishments for Military Education.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT desired to make a few observations upon the question of military education. He had spoken upon the subject on previous occasions; but, at the present moment, it was imperatively necessary that it should be brought before the Committee and the country. He did not find fault with any of the officers who had served on the Staff in the Soudan, excepting so far as it was agreed on all hands that the Intelligence Department in the Nile Expedition in the Soudan did not perform those services which were and ought to have been expected of it as well as it was hoped they might have been. When he believed that all the gallant officers who formed the Department were educated at the Staff College, the question very naturally suggested itself to one's mind whether the instruction they received at the Staff College was that which best fitted them to perform the great duties required of them. He should be very sorry to decry the Staff in any way; but if he were asked to pick out any body of officers who did their duty in the Soudan better than another—perhaps it was from the peculiar circumstances of the war—he should certainly pick out the gallant regimental officers. There were many officers of the Staff who were brilliant and clever, and who performed their duty well. He would not say whether some men did their duty in the Soudan or not; but this much he would say, that if all the Staff officers, and especially those of the Intelligence Department, had done their duty, they would not have to deplore so many casualties in that campaign. It was stated in all the newspapers—and when they read the statement in the public organs they naturally turned to see what authority there was for it—that there would be no opposition to the march from Korti across the desert *viâ* Abou Klea and Metammeh to Gubat. Why, when the troops arrived at Abou Klea there were thousands of the enemy ready to pour down upon them. Not one piece of information was conveyed to the officers marching across the country; and if it had not been for the gallant conduct of the 19th Hussars, who scouted and did their duty in the most admirable manner, very fatal consequences would have ensued. Now, what was it that men went to the Staff College to learn? Surely it was not only mathematics and foreign languages. He quite agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) when, in answer to a Question put to him earlier in the evening, he said foreign languages could be more properly and fully taught in the countries in which they were spoken than in the Staff College. He, too, was of opinion that mathematics should be eliminated from the subjects of instruction in the Staff College. The first thing that men should be taught when they went to the College should be how to manage, how to manœuvre, and how to manipulate all the different arms of the Service which they would have subsequently to command. At Aldershot, which was the experimental station, it was found that commands were given for a very considerable time, and that only one or two Generals were able to learn their business at a time. It very often happened that many men who were sent out had never commanded more than a brigade. Unless they had had practical education at home, unless they had been taught at home in the practical management of troops, how could they be expected to acquit themselves properly in the face of an enemy? He mentioned no names; all he said was that they had no right to expect men to be able to command men in the field unless they had proper and ample opportunity of learning their duties before they went into the field. It was impossible to have a better place than Aldershot at which to instruct men in their duties; but there were men there who knew comparatively little of what was required of them. That was the reason that in many instances they failed with their Staff. He called the attention of his right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith) to the question, so that when men were sent to the Staff College they should be taught all the things which it was material they should know when they came to command, or to assist in commanding, an army in the field.

SIR FREDERICK FITZ-WYGRAM said, he had been a little in doubt as to the proper occasion on which the observations he wished to make should be made; possibly they would be permissible upon this Vote. He desired to call attention to the importance of signalling in the Army. Signallers, especially mounted signallers, were becoming of greater importance every day; their importance was due to the means of rapid transit which now obtained, and to the greater power of range of rifle and gun. In former days armies could only move a few miles a-day, and their movements were well known; but now the base of an army could be shifted in a very short time. Now-a-days war was waged over a larger expanse of country than hitherto, and therefore it was absolutely necessary to have some means of transmitting intelligence quicker than man and horse could carry it. Signalling in the Army had been carried on for several years, and with very great success, but not with the success which he thought it deserved. The fact was that a very intelligent class of men were needed for signalling purposes, and it was requisite that they should be kept in constant practice. Signalling was carried on some time ago by flags, and of late years it had been also conducted by means of the heliograph, by which messages could be sent 30 or 40 miles. As he had already said, men of intelligence were needed as signallers; but it was impossible to get such men unless some pay was given to them for signalling. Signalling officers trained their men; but as soon as the men were trained they left for some paid employment. Unless the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) was prepared to provide some payment for the signallers, it would not be possible to have a satisfactory corps. He (Sir Frederick Fitz-Wygram) suggested that there should be 10 signallers attached to each regiment, and that each of the men should receive £1 a-year, to be paid after the annual examination. There were 180 corps in the Army, so that the adoption of his suggestion would give 1,800 signallers at a cost of £1,800 beyond the present expenses. He believed the money would be very well spent, because there was nothing more important to a General in the field than that he should receive reliable intelligence.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY, WAR DEPARTMENT (Mr. H. S. NORTHCOTE) said, that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) fully appreciated the importance of signalling; and the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Sir Frederick Fitz-Wygram) might rest assured that the subject would receive full consideration. He hoped he was right in assuming that the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) did not wish, in the remarks he had made, to draw any invidious distinction between one class of officers and another. He thought he would be borne out when he said that a College which turned out such gallant men as the late Sir Herbert Stewart could not be one deserving of very great censure. The remarks of the hon. and gallant Gentleman, however, should receive careful attention.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he was glad to hear what had fallen from the Financial Secretary to the War

Office (Mr. Northcote), because he was afraid the observations of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot) upon the officers of the Intelligence Department in the Soudan were liable to some misconception, and might convey some imputation upon the Staff officers of that Department which he hardly thought the hon. and gallant Gentleman intended them to convey. He understood the hon. and gallant Gentleman to say that the Intelligence Department failed to provide the officers commanding in the Soudan with the intelligence they ought to have possessed; but he did not understand the hon. and gallant Gentleman to adduce the slightest proof of the assertion. All he heard the hon. and gallant Gentleman say was that he read in several newspapers that there would be no fighting between Korti and Metammeh. He (the Marquess of Hartington) was not aware that it was the duty of the officers of the Intelligence Department to communicate intelligence they received to the newspaper correspondents whose reports the hon. and gallant Gentleman had read. He did not know from what information the hon. and gallant Gentleman supposed that no intelligence as to the movements of the enemy was conveyed to the responsible officers in command. It was very easily understood that reliable information in a country like the Soudan was extremely difficult to get. He believed the fact was that the Intelligence Department obtained an enormous amount of information, but a great deal of it was found to be incorrect. Some information there was which, no doubt, was accurate, and, perhaps, in all cases not sufficiently acted upon. But there was nothing to justify the hon. and gallant Gentleman in saying that Lord Wolseley and the other officers in command were informed that the desert column would meet with no strong opposition in the march from Korti to Metammeh. He thought it right to make these remarks, because he believed that, notwithstanding the difficulties experienced in obtaining very accurate information during the Soudan Campaign, there was not the slightest reason to suppose that the officers of the Intelligence Department failed in any degree in their duty.

Vote *agreed to.*

(6.) £51,700, Miscellaneous Effective Services.

MR. PULESTON said, he thought that reference might very properly be made on this Vote to the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts. He did not intend to make anything like a speech on the subject; but he considered that the question might very properly be brought before the Committee at this time, especially as there was now a Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) whom it was supposed was in sympathy with the views he (Mr. Puleston) and many others entertained on the question. He was very sorry to hear the other day, in reply to a Question, that nothing would be done in regard to the Contagious Diseases Acts this Session, because during the many years he had represented his constituents in the House of Commons he did not remember that there had been a greater unanimity of feeling amongst all classes, in the places were the Acts were in force, than there was upon the value of the Contagious Diseases Acts. Not only in Plymouth, but in kindred constituencies, there was a unanimity in deploring the repeal of those Acts which had seldom been attained upon any subject in any constituency in any country. It must not be forgotten that what was practically a repeal of the Acts was effected in deference to what he had more than once said was nothing more than a scratch vote. It was not worth while to discuss the parallels to the proceedings of the late Government in this matter, although he might very easily point out that the late Government did not display the same alacrity in giving force to wishes on other subjects which had been as strongly expressed. What was most remarkable was that the operation of those Acts was suspended in the face of the fact that the three Ministers most responsible on the subject—the noble Marquess the late Secretary of State for War (the Marquess of Hartington), the noble Earl the late First Lord of the Admiralty (the Earl of Northbrook), and the right hon. Gentleman the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt)—were entirely in favour of the continuance of the Acts. It had been the duty of those Ministers, of all others, to know how the Acts were carried out; they made it their business to acquaint themselves with the result of the operation of the Acts, and they came to the conclusion that there was no other course consistent with the interest of the country than to continue the operation of the Acts. For some reason or other, owing, no doubt, to the influence of the other Members of the Cabinet, effect was given to the Resolution of the House. He was quite aware that no practical effect could be given to any discussion on the present occasion. But the fact could be pointed out that the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) and the Committee generally were now in possession of the deplorable results of the repeal of the Acts. They were in possession of very clear Returns which had been made from several places interested in the question, and they were also in possession of the opinion which had been expressed since the Acts were suspended by the late Government by some of the most distinguished men both in the Army and in the Navy. He did not know that he could point to one man of distinction in any branch of the Service who was not resolutely opposed to the action taken by the late Government. In his own constituency there was no stronger opponent of the repeal of the Acts than Admiral Stewart. Admiral Stewart was opposed to him (Mr. Puleston) in politics. He was a man of enormous experience, and he supplemented his previous long experience of the Service by his experience in Devonport during the time he was Admiral commanding that Station. Nothing could be stronger or more emphatic in opposition to the course of the late Government in this matter than the speech that gallant Admiral delivered before he left Devonport last year. But everybody in the places to which the Acts chiefly applied was just as strong in opposition to the repeal of the Acts, and their opinion was based upon experience and not upon theory. Hon. Gentlemen opposite would not grant Local Option in this matter. The constituencies concerned were supposed to know nothing about the case. He hoped that to-night the Committee would hear from the Secretary of State for War that so far as the Government were concerned justice, at least, would be done. Whilst there was no time to give proper attention to the question now, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would assure them that if he occupied his present position in the next Parliament he would then do what time and circumstances would not permit him to do now. It was peculiarly fitting that a debate should take place upon this subject on the present occasion. Within the last week or two he had received more letters and Petitions from his constituents on the subject of the amendment of the Criminal Law than he ever remembered receiving on any subject; and, curiously enough, a considerable number of the letters came from the small minority who cried out loudly for the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts, but who now were equally loud in their demand for the insertion of quite as obnoxious clauses as any in those Acts in the new Criminal Code. That was an inconsistency which the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) would perhaps make it his business to explain away. He had no doubt that the hon. and learned Member, who was so strenuous and active in favour of the repeal of the Contagious Diseases Acts, would be quite as strongly in favour of putting in the Criminal Law Amendment Bill clauses far more stringent and exactly on the same lines as those he opposed so bitterly in the Contagious Diseases Acts. He (Mr. Puleston) would content himself, in conclusion, with expressing the hope that the right hon. Gentleman would assure the Committee that he would not rest in his labours until he had made himself thoroughly acquainted with the pros and cons of this question.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he wished to support the expression of opinion which had fallen from his hon. Friend the Member for Devonport (Mr. Puleston), and he hoped that some information would be given to the Committee, either from the Treasury Bench or the Front Opposition Bench, as to the policy which was to be pursued in the future upon this most vital question. He did not wish to embarrass the present Secretary of State for War; but he wished to point out that if it were true, as alleged by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) in a recent speech, that his right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith) was only a stop-gap or provisional Minister—in that case, they ought to hear from the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Hartington) some statement of the policy which he represented with regard to the maintenance of the Acts. Now, if there was one principle in the world which the noble Marquess and the official members of his late Department had supported more earnestly than any other it was the principle of these Acts. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington), the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt), and the late First Lord of the Admiralty (the Earl of Northbrook) had all expressed their unqualified approval of the beneficial results of the Acts whenever they had any opportunity of doing so; and, therefore, it was with the very greatest surprise that he saw the other day that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) had spoken of these Acts as "the odious Contagious Diseases Acts." Still more was he surprised to read a speech by the same right hon. Gentleman delivered quite recently at Hackney, in which he spoke of the attitude of the present Government in these graphic terms—

> "I say that a strategic movement of this kind, executed in opposition to the notorious convictions of the men who effected it, carried out for Party purposes and Party purposes alone, is the most flagrant instance of political dishonesty, even of political immorality, that this country has ever known."

Now, he wished to ask the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington), and the hon. Members of the late Government who sat beside him, whether they were about to execute a "strategic movement," and were about to be guilty, according to the view of their Colleague, "of one of the most flagrant instances of political dishonesty this country had ever known?" Now, there could be no doubt whatever—it was a matter of history—that the "Contagious Diseases Acts" were introduced and carried in that House by the so-called Liberal Party, and had been supported by them for many years. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) had sat in that House before he was a Member of the Government, but he had not raised up his voice against those "odious" Acts, nor had he done so after he took Office as the President of the Board of Trade; and yet he had now the audacity to charge his (Mr. Bentinck's) right hon. Friends with political tergiversation and political immorality. He thought the Committee would agree with him that persons clothed in inflammable material should not approach too near the fire. He (Mr. Bentinck) had sat four years on the Committee which was appointed to investigate this question, and which considered fully every species of evidence which could be produced, and he had attended all the meetings of that Committee with the exception of four. There were two Parties on that Committee, as they well knew. One Party, that to which he belonged, held that the result of the suspension of these Acts would be not only greatly to increase disease in the Army and Navy, but to aggravate the sufferings of unfortunate women—and here he desired to repeat that he had supported the Acts from the first, not so much in the interest of soldiers and sailors, as in the interests of suffering women, who had unhappily adopted a profession which he hesitated to call by the name which was properly applicable to it—and the other Party in the Committee held the view that there would be no increase either of disease, or of suffering amongst women. And what had been the result of the suspension of the Acts? A Return furnished to Parliament by the noble Marquess the late Secretary of State for War (the Marquess of Hartington) showed that disease had already increased in the Army and Navy to such an extent that it now stood at as high a figure as it had done before the Acts came into force in 1866. That was a state of things which was much to be deplored, for if the results were deplorable to the Services, with regard to the unfortunate women they were simply appalling. The contention of the Party with which he acted on the Committee, supported by facts and reason, was that if they suspended the Acts juvenile prostitution would increase, and that the nature of the disease amongst females would increase in severity. Both these prophecies had been fulfilled. He had made personal inquiries into the subject, and had received Reports from the Lock Hospital in London and from the Lock Hospital at Chatham, and the results he had obtained were these. In the London Lock Hospital, which had a Government ward, the average number of women admitted from the protected districts in connection with the hospital was about 500 a-year, and the majority light cases. In the year ending June 30, 1882, the cases of gonorrhœa were 183 out of 464 admissions, and the cases of secondary syphilis were only 33 per cent upon the whole number of 464, while the average duration of treatment of each patient was only about 23 days. But in the year ending the 30th of June last, the number of admissions had fallen from 500 to 110, the proportion of cases of secondary syphilis had risen to 78 per cent of the whole number, and the average duration of treatment of each patient had risen to 51 days. Out of these 110 cases, 85 were secondary syphilis, one tertiary, 11 primary syphilis, and the residue gonorrhœa. Now, he repeated that that was an appalling state of things, and showed how the suspension of the Acts had been the cause of increased suffering to these unfortunate women. But that was not all. The Secretary of this Institution wrote to him lately, that 30 of these 110 patients were 20 years of age; and that of 12 patients then in the Government ward, one had been under treatment for six months, two for three months each, two had been in once before, one had been in twice, one three times, one five times, and one no fewer than 31 times. He would now take the Committee from London to Chatham. At Chatham they had a Lock Hospital, which embraced nearly all the patients in the Southern districts, and he had received three letters from thence on the subject of these Acts. One was from the Chairman of the Chatham Board of Health, another was from the Lady Superintendent of the Chatham Lock Hospital, and one from the Rev. Mr. Jelf, the Rector of Chatham. The Chairman of the Chatham Board of Health said—

"In April last the Chatham Board of Health made a unanimous representation to the late Prime Minister asking him not to repeal, but rather to renew the Acts, seeing the enormous evils that had fallen upon our town through their suspension. I allude especially to the great development of very young female prostitution in our town, which cannot be ignored, but which, while deplored by all, is a monument of real disgrace to men, who, actuated by stupid sentimentality, have managed to suspend, and now seek to repeal Acts, which, when in full force, saved hundreds of young girls from ruin, restored hundreds of fallen young girls to their families, and established order and respectability in our streets; the converse of all which benefit has been brought about by men who, whilst claiming to be the defenders of purity and female virtue, have opened the floodgates of dissipation and worked a ruin of body and soul on numbers of young girls in our town perfectly diabolical in its results and awful to contemplate from a truly Christian point of view."

Now, this letter was supplemented by the testimony of Miss Webb, the Lady Superintendent of the Chatham Lock Hospital, who was probably one of the best witnesses that it was possible for them to hear. She said—

"With regard to the effect on the women admitted to this hospital during the last year, owing to the withdrawal of the Contagions Diseases Acts' police, I have to say that under the Contagious Diseases Acts in their entirety the highest number admitted in a year was in 1872, 702 cases; the lowest in 1876, when 436 were admitted. At that time this hospital only received women from the so-called Chatham district. On the withdrawal of the police the Shorncliffe district was added, and with that addition in the 12 months dating from the 6th of June, 1884, to the 6th of June, 1885, only 175 cases have come in. Knowing as we all do the immense increase of these unfortunate women in these towns since the Contagious Diseases Acts' police have been removed, it is fearful to contemplate how many ought to come in compared with those who do so, and the terrible mischief accruing in consequence. With regard to the condition of the patients since the alteration of the law, there is a marked difference for the worse; and, moreover, it takes in most cases many months for their cure. In some cases the nine months—after which period no patient is to be kept in hospital under any circumstances whatever—is far from long enough, and four women this year asked for and obtained re-admission, one of whom has this day been discharged after five more months' treatment in addition to the nine. This class of women will not seek admission till they feel absolutely compelled, and many who come in are sad wrecks under 20 years of age. The usual routine of work, such as helping in the laundry, etc., as carried out before, has had to be abandoned, the patients being too ill to do it, and charwomen are obliged to be employed instead. Indeed, could these zealous but mistaken people see as we see the fruits of what they have accomplished in the withdrawal of the police, they would be compelled to admit how cruel the change is for the poor women, while the crowd of juvenile prostitutes in these towns proves how great has been the blow to morality; and I would ask those who oppose the Contagious Diseases Acts, on the ground of their immorality, if they consider the unrestricted depravity going on in their stead a matter for content or congratulation?"

The Rev. Mr. Jelf, the Rector of Chatham, also wrote a letter quite recently to a newspaper, in which he said—

"With regard to the evil which does exist, it must be remembered that we have special difficulties," and he went on to enumerate among them—

> "The suspension of the Contagious Diseases Acts, which, on the one hand, brings few but hardened women to the Lock Hospital, and, on the other hand, encourages quite young girls in prostitution."

Now, he had also to say that he had received that day a long letter from Archdeacon Harrison, Archdeacon of Maidstone and Canon of Canterbury, empowering him to use his name, and asserting that exactly the same state of things had occurred at Canterbury. He mentioned these facts, because they were approaching a General Election, and they all knew the powerful organization, which was headed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld), supported by other hon. Members, had a very powerful effect. That organization had ample funds, and a literature peculiarly its own, approximating to certain recent publications by a journal which revived all their worst recollections of Holywell Street, and which had met with the general condemnation of every right-thinking man in that House. That organization sent also paid lecturers about the country, and were materially assisted by what the late M. Fouché designated as his "Cohorte Cythère," a band of women who addressed assemblies of their sex upon these subjects with closed doors, so that no one could know what was said; but there could be no doubt that misrepresentations were made, and untruths without number told, so that the minds of the women might be worked upon to induce ignorant men to vote in a particular direction. The peculiar literature which the opponents of the Acts published and circulated throughout the country was a disgrace to civilization; for anybody who had served on the public Committee appointed to inquire into the matter, or who had read the proceedings of that Committee, must know that all the material statements contained in those publications were absolutely untrue. He (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) had called attention more than once to a pamphlet which was entitled *Seven Reasons for Repeal of the Acts*, and which was issued by a Society in the City of London, of which the hon. Member for Bristol (Mr. Samuel Morley) was President, and the hon. Member for Lambeth (Sir William M'Arthur) was a leading member. Those "Seven Reasons" were neither more nor less than a set of scandalous fabrications, and were proved to be so by the evidence given before the Parliamentary Committee relating to the action of the police. Yet, notwithstanding, the hon. Member for Bristol and the hon. and worthy Alderman (Sir William M'Arthur), without any inquiry into the matter, did not scruple to lend their names to the dissemination of these abominable falsehoods. The particular process by which the agitators against the Acts endeavoured to attain their ends was simply diabolical. Their object was to poison the minds of the new electorate, by false allegations to the effect that the Acts subjected women of the humbler classes to unjust and arbitrary arrest by the police, to indignities too shameful to mention, and, finally, to hospital experiments. Now, those were allegations which had been made wholesale within the last month or six weeks in his (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck's) own constituency, by a Mr. James B. Wookey, who was engaged as a paid emissary to carry out this shameful work, and by this means, as he had said, to poison the minds of the new electorate; and it was absolutely necessary for those who had supported those Acts from the very first that they should clear themselves in that House, because they really had no other efficient mode of answering those unfounded charges except in their places there. They had no great organization to disseminate poison throughout the country by the exercise of what the right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) lately called "the faculty for slander and lying." He (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) would not have thought it necessary to enter so fully upon the subject except that, possibly, that might be the last time he might have the opportunity of doing so in that House. They did not know what accidents might happen; they might happen anywhere, even at a General Election, and to the very best of them, even to hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on the Opposition side of the House; and, therefore, he had felt it his duty to enter an energetic protest against untruthful speeches and publications, with the earnest hope that before long, when the subject came before the House again, it might be treated from a broad point of view, and with due regard for suffering women. His hon. Friend (Mr. Puleston) had alluded to a measure which was in the air; but he (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) did not believe that any such airy measures would prevent juvenile prostitution or extirpate those grievous diseases; but there could be no doubt, that by the action of the Contagious Diseases Acts, juvenile prostitution had been very considerably diminished; and if the Acts were not revived, the same results, which existed before they were brought into operation, would follow.

Mr. WHITBREAD said, he could not help feeling moved by the feeling accents in which the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) had taken leave of the House. He deprecated the discussion, however, especially as the hon. Member for Devonport (Mr. Puleston) had admitted that nothing could result from it. As far as he understood the present position, it was this—that the originator of the steps which had brought about the present state of things and the Secretary of State for War had agreed that the matter should be allowed to remain *in statu quo* for the present, and that it would be impossible to set up the Acts again without a Resolution of the House. That had been agreed to by his right hon. Friend the Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld). In fact, he understood that there was a truce between them, and he was sorry that that truce had been broken; he was certain it had not been broken with the consent of his right hon. Friend. At that period of the Session no conclusion could be arrived at, and, therefore, it was to be regretted that the discussion had been raised. What a storm would have come from the Benches opposite a few years ago if this question had been raised by the Liberal Party, when it was known that no conclusion could be come to; and he could only conclude that the course taken that night was taken by hon. Gentlemen opposite with a view to promote their own personal ends at the approaching General Election.

Mr. PULESTON rose to Order, and explained that he had no personal ends in view at all. He had merely raised the question for what he believed to be the public good.

Mr. WHITBREAD thought that as no conclusion could be come to it would have been better if the truce had been preserved, for it was a very unpleasant subject which had been raised. He would not go into the right hon. and learned Gentleman's statistics; but he thought the statistics on this subject were susceptible to other conclusions to those he had drawn, and probably as high a rate of disease would be found to have prevailed at times when the Acts were rigorously enforced as at present when they were not. The hon. Member had said that they knew nothing about this subject; but he would point out that 25 years ago he had sat upon a Committee to inquire into the matter, and that Committee had then pointed out the line which they could follow safely, and to which they would have to come now. They showed them how fallacious it was to believe that statutory laws would check the disease, and that in those places where the laws were the severest the disease was worst. That Committee had come to the conclusion that it was right to heal disease wherever they found it; but to go beyond that and introduce the compulsory powers of Continental laws was a step they did not recommend, and it was one that they were sure would be opposed to the sentiments of the English people, and would not be tolerated by the public feeling of the country. Now, he had never used hard words about the introduction of the Acts. He did not say that they were smuggled through the House; but he did say that they were brought into that House and carried without discussion. [Mr. Cavendish Bentinck: No.] There had practically been no discussion upon the Acts. They were brought in by Lord Clarence Paget, and the first Act was passed, if he remembered rightly, after what could not be called a discussion. He knew that Lord Clarence Paget had acted with the best intentions, his object being to preserve the health of the men in the Navy. He knew very well what pressure was brought to bear upon him by the Medical Staff of the Navy in order to introduce these foreign customs into England. They took, as it were, a piece of the practice of foreign countries, and attempted to fit it in to English law and life, forgetting that the feeling in England on these subjects was happily widely different from that which ruled abroad. He repeated, without fear of contradiction, that the first of the Acts was put upon the Statute Book without any discussion worthy of the name. They were very proud in that Parliament of theirs of the fact that when once a law was placed on the Statute Book it was rarely struck off again in after years. They were very proud of the steadiness and consistency of their legislation in that respect; but the reason was that laws did not get on the Statute Book until they had been thoroughly discussed and approved in the public mind. This law was not fully discussed, and never had been accepted by public opinion, and when it was on the Statute Book those who were in favour of it did their utmost to prevent the discussion of the question. There were storms of abuse for persons who endeavoured to discuss the Acts; but it had been discussed, and public opinion had been aroused on the subject, and the defenders of the Act were now in this position—that they never could get back to the enforcement of the Acts. They might, perhaps, make it impossible to work a voluntary system; but they could never get back to a compulsory system. They were now half way between the Acts and the voluntary system. He had always been an advocate of the voluntary system; he believed much might be done under it; and he believed, further, that had that system been adhered to from the first, instead of having these efforts made at a few seaport towns and military stations, they would have spread far and wide. But sad mischief had been played with the voluntary system; the idea of entering a hospital had been rendered so repulsive that it would take years before many women could be got to enter one, although he believed that, if the voluntary system were trusted to, they would in time come back again to the position in which the matter stood before the Act was introduced. They might try the voluntary system—he was quite certain that they would never be allowed to try the other.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) said, the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had correctly represented the position in which they stood with reference to the discussion of this question upon the Estimates. He (Mr. W. H. Smith) fully admitted the right of hon. Members to express their views on the subject; but he reminded the Committee that there was an understanding that, as far as possible, this question should not be discussed on these Estimates. It was distinctly understood that Her Majesty's Government could not now indicate a policy, or depart from the course taken with regard to the question by their Predecessors in Office; and he, for one, deprecated a discussion which must be wholly and absolutely fruitless. The hon. Gentleman who had introduced the subject was, he felt convinced, actuated by the best motives; but, with the most earnest desire to contribute at the proper time to the solution of the question, he trusted that the Committee would not discuss the matter then.

SIR ROBERT FOWLER (LORD MAYOR) said, he could not allow the discussion to close without expressing the hope that it would not be supposed by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) and the hon. Member for Devonport (Mr. Puleston) that the Conservative Party were unanimously in favour of the opinion they had expressed. He, for one, had a strong feeling against these Acts, holding, as he did, to the good old Tory principle that what was morally wrong could not be politically right.

MR. PULESTON said, he could not conceive that he could be justly amenable to censure on the part of his right hon. Friend (Mr. W. H. Smith) for raising a discussion from which no practical result would follow. That was done with regard to every Vote, and was of daily occurrence in the House. They had that evening had a discussion in which an hon. Member had said he supported an Amendment although he knew it would not be carried. So much for that. He had, he believed, in a modest way expressed the almost unanimous opinion of officers and clergymen, including Dissenters in the towns where the Acts in question were in operation, and he could not bring himself to say that they were all sinners and that they were all wrong. He should regret very much to be amenable to the censure of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. H. Smith); but he was not aware that any arrangement had been made beyond this—that it was said nothing would be done in respect of this Act; and, therefore, speaking in the interest of the large body of persons whom he represented, and with all respect to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War, he repudiated the severe censure which the right hon. Gentleman had passed upon him.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he did not rise for the purpose of continuing a discussion which, as it had been pointed out, could not lead to any practical result. All he desired was that the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. W. H. Smith) should give his attention to the subject during the Recess. It had been admitted that the state of things which resulted from the decision of the House two years ago was extremely unsatisfactory, and it was apparent that that state of things could not be allowed to continue. An attempt had been made by the late Government last year to modify the law, and put it in conformity with what appeared to be the opinion of the great majority of the House. But it was impossible to carry a Bill for the purpose, and it would be equally impossible to carry one in the present state of affairs. If the right hon. Gentleman examined the circumstances, and if he arrived at the opinion that it would be possible in the present state of the country to deal with the compulsory clauses of the Act, it would probably enable them to put a stop to the anomalous state of things which existed, and also enable them to give a fair opportunity to the voluntary principle as suggested by the hon. Member for Bedford (Mr. Whitbread).

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he had never heard anything about a truce in this matter. If there were such a truce he, for one, could be no party to it, as he thought it the duty of every man having before him such facts as were shown in the Return to maintain his position, because the Return practically confuted every reasonable argument that had been adduced against the Acts. The hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Whitbread) had said that the Acts had been smuggled through the House; but he (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) denied that statement absolutely. A reference to public records would show that the Acts were opposed at the time by Mr. Ayrton and other Members of the House. Besides, how could the hon. Member shelter himself from the fact that during the 16 years the Acts had been on the Statute Book he had not raised his voice or taken action against them? The hon. Gentleman was no doubt very sore because his pet nostrum, the voluntary system, had broken down; but he (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) had shown by figures that even in the short time which had elapsed between the suspension of the Acts and the present day the admission of women to Lock Hospitals had enormously fallen off. It was also a sad fact that the average number of inmates of the London Lock Hospital Home had fallen from over 80 to under 60. The hon. Gentleman talked about the voluntary system; but he would ask him whether he was a member of the London Lock Hospital, or to what Hospital did he subscribe? With reference to the remarks of the Lord Mayor, he would only say that if he was in favour of allowing suffering women to remain without care under the circumstances, he (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) was not one of his supporters.

Vote *agreed to.*

(7.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £248,100, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Salaries and Miscellaneous Charges of the War Office, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886."

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER said, this was the Vote from which the salaries of the Medical Staff were taken, and he wished to say a few words upon it in justice to Dr. Crawford, whose conduct had been seriously attacked. He held in his hand a letter from General Freemantle, who commanded at Suakin, and who afterwards commanded the Guards' Brigade in the Campaign, which, with the permission of the Committee, he would read. General Freemantle said—

> "So far as my observation and knowledge goes, the hospital arrangements for the Campaign in the Eastern Soudan were very good. I speak as regards the field hospitals, the bearer companies, the base hospital, and the ship *Ganges*; the latter was the admiration of all who saw her. The arrangements for the quick transfer of sick and wounded from the front to the base and ship seemed to me to be excellent.'

He wished to remind the Committee that this year they had provided for the trial of a number of men who were to form the nucleus of bearer companies for larger Expeditions than that of Suakin. Every year those men would be taken from ordinary drill and put under the direction of medical officers of the district to learn the duties essential in a large Expedition. That arrangement was in accordance with the recommendations made by Surgeon Major Evatt, who was known as a great reformer of the Army Medical Department. Surgeon Major Evatt said—

> "I want to see a regular Militia Hospital Corps called out annually and trained with us in the hospitals instead of being kept at Infantry drill in the barracks. We need such a body of men to work our home hospitals in war time, as well as to furnish the coarser aid in the war hospitals."

He (Sir Arthur Hayter) believed that if the men went through their ordinary drill in the manner he had mentioned they would have the nucleus of an Army Hospital Corps, with a very large staff at the service of the country when required. He would only call the attention of the Committee to the fact that provision was made for four bearer corps, the members of which were taken from all the principal London hospitals. Those men had been inspected by Dr. Crawford; they had taken part in the Brighton Review, and it was right to say that they had given every satisfaction.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, there was one item in this Vote which he thought required explanation. The salary of the Commander-in-Chief was put down at £6,632; but the commencing salary was £4,500. There was a note at the bottom of the page; but still there was no explanation given of the discrepancy. Perhaps the hon. Gentleman at the moment representing the War Office would be able to explain what it meant.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY, WAR DEPARTMENT (Mr. H. S. NORTHCOTE) said, it was under an old Regulation. The salary of the future Commander-in-Chief would be £4,500.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he did not see why they should wait until there was a new Commander-in-Chief. He perceived that the Secretary of State for War received £5,000 per annum; and yet the Commander-in-Chief was put down for £6,632. He saw no reason why the present Commander-in-Chief should receive that amount; and as the Committee were asked to say whether they would pay the amount or not, he should move the reduction of the Vote by £1,600.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £246,500, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge for the Salaries and Miscellaneous Charges of the War Office, which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, the hon. Member for Northampton stated that no explanation was given with reference to the amount taken in the Vote for the salary of the Commander-in-Chief, although there was an asterisk affixed to the item. If the hon. Member would look at the bottom of the page he would see the explanation that the salary was paid under Royal Warrant. He thought the hon. Member must admit that if the Commander-in-Chief and other officers appointed under Army Warrants held office at all, they were entitled to the salaries fixed at the time when they accepted the appointments.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, he understood the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) to move the reduction of the Vote on the ground that His Royal Highness was paid more than the salary under the Warrant. He thought this Motion ought to receive support from Members of that House. He desired to speak with very great respect of His Royal Highness. He had often inquired of soldiers and officers, and he always found that they had great respect and confidence in His Royal Highness in regimental matters. But he supported the Motion of his hon. Friend, because he had read that in 1850, when the House voted a pension of £12,000 to the Duke of Cambridge, his right hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham then moved an addition to the Act, proposing that His Royal Highness should not receive any further emolument or pay from the State for any office which he might fill as long as he continued to receive the £12,000 a-year. Now, His Royal Highness had received that large sum every year since 1850; he also received £6,632 under the Vote before the Committee as Commander-in-Chief; and he further received £1,000 a-year as Colonel of the Grenadier Guards, and £1,000 a-year as

Ranger of the Royal Parks. That was £20,632 a-year, paid by the taxpayers of the country. The question was whether the salary allowed under this Army Estimate should be reduced. He should support the Motion before the Committee, because he thought they should emphatically mark their opinion on this Vote that when a person, whether Prince or otherwise, received a pension from the State, he should not, in addition, receive the full emoluments of any other office of the State. When the expense on account of the Royal House was so largely increased, and seeing that there would be a time when these estimable and deserving Princes would be engaged in the Service of the State, he thought that the Committee should consider whether, in addition to the pensions they received, they should also have the full pay of the offices with which they might be accommodated by the State. For these reasons he should certainly support the Motion of his hon. Friend.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 28; Noes 95: Majority 67.—(Div. List, No. 248.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(8.) £18,500, Rewards for Distinguished Services.

(9.) £78,000, Half-Pay.

(10.) £1,194,000, Retired Pay, &c.

(11.) £124,800, Widows' Pensions, &c.

Colonel NOLAN said, that on this Vote he should like to call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) to an incident which happened some time ago—the bursting of a shell, and the consequent death of three officers who were conducting experiments at the time. When he had first heard of the accident he had asked the Government whether the widows of these officers would receive pensions just as though their husbands had been killed on active service. His opinion was that they ought to—that they might fairly claim to—be treated in the same way as the widows of officers killed on active service. The widow of a Warrant Officer was also interested in this matter, her husband having been killed at the same time; but he did not know whether, strictly speaking, her case would come under this Vote. These accidents were very rare indeed; he did not think that, on an average, there would be more than five or six deaths of this kind during the year—deaths owing to the bursting of a gun or accidental shooting, as in the case of a marker at a target. The Committee, he thought, was very favourable to the view he took; and he was not aware that the noble Marquess the late Secretary of State for War (the Marquess of Hartington) had decided the matter. The subject was one well worthy of the attention of the Secretary of State for War.

Sir ARTHUR HAYTER said, that the pensions of these widows were fixed under the 2,006th Article; and it was impossible to grant them a higher amount than they had received. In cases where deceased officers had lost their life in the Service, but otherwise than in action, the widow's pension was 50 per cent less than the rate allowed in the case of officers killed in action. However lamentable a case might be, such was the rule; and, in the present instance, the widows had received the highest pensions possible.

Colonel NOLAN said, his point was not that the Financial Secretary to the War Office was partial, or had not followed the Rules; but that the Rule was wrong, that it should be modified, and that it would cost the country very little if altered; probably not more than £2,000 or £3,000 a-year. These Rules were not made by Act of Parliament, but by the authority of the War Office. The Secretary of State for War could modify them when he chose. He could alter them in each case, or could issue a special Warrant. He (Colonel Nolan) complained not that any particular hardship had been inflicted on these widows by the Secretary of State for War, or the Financial Secretary, but that, if such a Rule as that referred to did exist, it was an extremely hard one, and did not conduce to the benefit of the Public Service. When officers were engaged in the duty of handling loaded shells—an extremely dangerous duty — he thought it only right that the War Office should allow their widows and families, where fatal accidents occurred, the same provision as was allowed to the widows and families of officers killed in action. When he had put questions on this subject before, the House of Commons had thought that something of the kind he had suggested should be done; and he was of opinion that the Secretary of State for War should give the subject his favourable consideration, even, if necessary, to the extent of modifying the Rule.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) said, he could only say that he sympathized with the object the hon. and gallant Gentleman had in view, and that, if it had been possible, his Predecessors in Office would have carried out that object. There was evidence of every desire on their part to meet the views of the hon. and gallant Gentleman; but, as the hon. and gallant Gentleman must be aware, it was not such an easy matter for the Secretary of State to alter a Rule. The Rule applied not only to the Department of War, but to the Navy as well, and the sanction of the Treasury was necessary to any such change. If that were obtained, and the modification were made, they would have to consider the claims of persons who had been pensioned under the old Rule for some considerable time past. However, the hon. and gallant Gentleman might rest assured that if it should be found possible to take a compassionate view of hard cases of this kind there would be every desire to do so.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON said, he had made inquiries into this matter, and had ascertained that the change suggested would lead to wider results than the hon. and gallant Gentleman seemed to suppose. As the hon. and gallant Member had truly said, there was more than one rate of pension. There was a small rate to the widows of those who died in the Service, but whose deaths were not traceable to active service; there was the rate to the widows of those who lost their lives from disease, or privation, or exposure, incident to active operations in the field, or in consequence of wounds received in the performance of military duty, otherwise than in action; then there was the highest scale to the families of those who died in active service, or in consequence of wounds received in active service. If the suggestion of the hon. and gallant Gentleman were adopted, it would open the door to a state of things which would render it almost impossible to make any difference in these rates at all. He did not think they would be able to maintain any distinctions at all. No doubt, originally, these rates had been carefully considered, and that, on the whole, the distinctions made were reasonable. The case the hon. and gallant Gentleman had mentioned was a very hard one; but they knew very well that it was not necessary in the Service; that the arrangement proposed should be carried out—that was to say, that the present system of widows' pensions were not found to do harm to the Service generally.

Vote *agreed to.*

(12.) £18,500, Pensions for Wounds.

(13.) £33,100, Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals.

(14.) £1,330,000, Out-Pensions.

(15.) £190,700, Superannuation Allowances.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he did not know whether it would be out of place here to question the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War as to whether any compensation was to be paid to those who had served on the Nile. He should be, of course, subject to the ruling of the Chairman.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): That would not come under this Vote.

Vote *agreed to.*

(16.) £49,900, Retired Allowances, &c., to Officers of the Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteer Forces.

DR. FARQUHARSON said, that before this Vote passed, he should like to make an appeal to the Secretary of State for War on behalf of the Militia surgeons, or, at any rate, a portion of those gentlemen who had been compulsorily retired on account of old age, and whose compulsory retirement had placed them in a position of hardship and poverty, and even destitution. It would be in the recollection of the Committee that the subject was brought before the notice of the House two years ago by the hon. Member for South Warwickshire

(Sir Eardley Wilmot), who, in a speech of great detail, made out a very good case. The encouragement they had received on that occasion had induced them to bring the matter before the Committee again. At that hour of the night (12.20 A.M.) he would not go into detail; but he would just mention that in 1874 the right of Militia surgeons to pensions was admitted, and, although in 1876 a new Warrant was issued defining their retirement and pay, they were yet led to believe, by inquiries which they instituted through a not unnatural feeling of suspicion, that their existing rates would not be interfered with. Well, in 1881, a Circular was issued making retirement at the age of 65 compulsory. A certain number of these unfortunate men were summarily retired—relegated into private life, and deprived, in many instances, of all means of sustenance, and reduced to such straits that one of them, to his own knowledge, had since been an inmate of a workhouse. Some had a practice to fall back upon; but, in many instances, owing to the frequency with which these gentlemen were obliged to absent themselves from the neighbourhood of their private work, their practices were destroyed; and many of these surgeons on retiring from the Militia were too old to establish new practices. The British Medical Association, which was a very powerful body, numbering nearly 12,000, had petitioned on several occasions to have this question of pension reconsidered. There were, after all, only 20 of these gentlemen, and the pension of 6*s*. per day, which they thought they were entitled to, would only amount to £2,000. As by the abolition of the Militia Medical Department, £14,000 was saved to the country, they thought it not an extravagant thing that some portion of that saving should be devoted to meeting their demands, which he could not help thinking were just. All these poor old men, many of whom were spending their last few days in destitution, asked was that there might be some simple inquiry instituted. They did not ask for anything more definite. They were quite content that some inquiry should be made into their case. He would reiterate the hope, on sitting down, that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for War would, during the Recess, see his way to granting this inquiry, which was all that was asked for at the present time.

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY, WAR DEPARTMENT (Mr. H. S. NORTHCOTE) said, he was afraid, unfortunately, that he could not give the hon. Member a very satisfactory answer on this subject. Speaking as the mouthpiece of the War Office, he was bound to say that the difficulty lay in the premises of the hon. Gentleman. The War Office altogether denied those premises. They held that the Acts prior to that of 10 *Geo*. IV., treated Militia surgeons as part of the permanent Staff. That Act, however, reduced the permanent Staff, and made no provision for Militia surgeons thereon; besides which it relieved them from the obligation of residing near the head-quarters of the corps, which was still required of members left on the permanent Staff. The War Office denied the contention of the surgeons, that the 31 & 32 *Vict*. provided for any surgeons other than those who retired before 1829. They denied also that the surgeons had the right to claim that the terms on which they joined included irremovability on account of age, the Crown having always claimed the right to decide when they should retire. With regard to the request made by the hon. Gentleman for an inquiry, he could not go the length of promising one. The matter had already been fully investigated, and he could not, on the part of the Government, give a pledge that any further measures would be taken in that direction.

Vote *agreed to.*

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

(17.) £39,093, to complete the sum for the Lord Advocate and Criminal Proceedings, Scotland.

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

(18.) £106,333, to complete the sum for the British Museum.

(19.) £14,498, to complete the sum for Universities, &c. in Scotland.

(20.) £1,700, to complete the sum for the National Gallery, &c. Scotland.

CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS.

(21.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £18,142, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Salaries and Incidental Expenses of Temporary Commissions and Committees, including Special Inquiries."

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, the Committee had reason to complain that the cost of Temporary Commissions was never placed on the Estimates at an early period in the operations of these Bodies. It was not long ago that the House had had to provide £35,000 as the cost of the Royal Commission on Agriculture. He would now appeal very strongly to the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury—now that they had a Government in power which seemed likely to institute these Commissions in all parts of the country—to have an estimate as to the cost of a Commission placed before the House when such Commission was appointed. In the case of the Commission on Agriculture, the House had been committed to an expenditure of nearly £40,000, without being able to give any opinion upon the subject. It certainly seemed to him desirable that the House should not be led into heavy expenditure unawares.

MR. WHITLEY said, an hon. Friend of his, who was not now present, the hon. Gentleman the Member for North Lincolnshire (Mr. Atkinson), had on the Paper an Amendment to this Vote. In the hon. Member's absence, he (Mr. Whitley) would call attention to the question which would have been raised by that Amendment. It had reference to the Royal Commission on Shipping. Now, those who represented the shipping interest in the House felt that to publish the evidence in part was a very great hardship on the shipowners generally. So far as he knew, the Royal Commission had received the evidence of the Board of Trade, and the Board of Trade only; and though he was afraid the House had no power over the Royal Commissioners, yet he did feel that it was a great hardship that the evidence taken up to the present time should be published, and probably used for electioneering purposes during the Recess. They felt that it was very unjust that this evidence should be published in part before the whole of it was taken by the Royal Commission. Under the circumstances, his hon. Friend had placed on the Paper a Motion to reduce the sum by what they considered would be the cost of the publication. It certainly seemed to him (Mr. Whitley) most unjust that in the present state of this question only one side of the evidence should be published over the length and breadth of the country. The shipowners ought to have had an equal opportunity of making their views known. He was told there had been great difference of opinion amongst the Commissioners on the subject of publishing this evidence, and that the shipowners had voted against it; but he did maintain that to place one side of the evidence before the country, before the other side had been adduced, was most unfair to those interests which had been attacked. He begged to propose the Amendment which his hon. Friend would have moved had he been present.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £17,942, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Salaries and Incidental Expenses of Temporary Commissions and Committees, including Special Inquiries."—(*Mr. Whitley.*)

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) said, that, as the hon. Member supposed, the Government had no power over Royal Commissions. He was informed that a certain amount of evidence on both sides had been taken; and if there had been anything like unfairness, the responsibility for it rested with the Commissioners. He, therefore, hoped the hon. Member would withdraw his Motion—which, presumably, was only brought forward to enable him to raise a discussion. He (Sir Henry Holland) did not think it would be possible, in the Estimates, each year to put down an item beforehand as to the cost of the Royal Commissions which might be instituted. The House could always learn from Ministers what Commissions were likely to be appointed and the names of the Commissioners.

MR. TOMLINSON said, they had on the Treasury Bench a Member of the Commission on Shipping, the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst), and from him they ought to have heard something in reply to the statement of the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Whitley). The case of the shipowners was particularly hard. It would be remembered that when the late President of the Board of Trade (Mr. Chamberlain) brought before the House his Bill dealing with shipping, out of which this Commission had arisen, he had occupied nearly the whole night in making out his case against the shipowners; and the shipowners, although they desired an opportunity of representing their side of the question, were never allowed to do so. The Commission was appointed, certain witnesses had been examined, and the proceedings had been published without waiting for the evidence of the shipowners to be given; and he certainly thought the matter was one which called for some protest and explanation. If the hon. Member (Mr. Whitley) went to a division, in order to record a protest against this course of conduct, he (Mr. Tomlinson) should vote with him.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Mr. Gorst) said, the hon. Member had referred to him, and in reply he had to say that he was not at liberty to disclose in that House the proceedings of the Commission. He had heard the observations of hon. Gentlemen, and he could assure them that there was a large majority on the Commission who desired to do what was fair and reasonable. When the proceedings of the Commission were disclosed, it would be found that there was no foundation for the suspicion of unfairness on the part of the Commissioners.

Mr. WHITLEY: I do not press the Amendment.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(22.) £3,868, to complete the sum for Miscellaneous Expenses.

AFGHAN WAR.

(23.) £250,000, Grant in Aid.

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

(24.) £857,733, to complete the sum for Customs.

(25.) £1,643,157, to complete the sum for Inland Revenue.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £4,254,659, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Post Office Services, the Expenses of Post Office Savings Banks, and Government Annuities and Insurances, and the Collection of the Post Office Revenue."

Mr. SEXTON said, he had not expected this Vote to be brought on that night. At Question time he had given Notice that when the Vote came on, he would call attention to the course pursued by the Post Office in regard to the service of mails in Ireland. He thought he had some just ground of complaint. When he gave that Notice the Postmaster General made no intimation that he would take the Vote that night, and he (Mr. Sexton) certainly had not expected that it would be so taken. Attempts had been made on previous occasions to procure a better Mail Service between Dublin and the West of Ireland, the present Service involving a serious dislocation of the business of the country. At that late hour, however, he could not undertake to place this matter properly before the Committee; and he would, therefore, appeal to the Government to bring the matter on on some other occasion. He would move to report Progress; but if the Government would see their way to grant the claim of Ireland in regard to this Mail Service—which would only involve an additional expenditure of £3,000—he would not press the Motion.

Mr. ION HAMILTON supported the claim put forward on behalf of the mercantile interests of Ireland. The matter had been carefully considered; it was of importance to the whole of Ireland, and he trusted the noble Lord (Lord John Manners) would be able to see his way to put the matter right. The question was purely one of public and private convenience.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord John Manners) said, he quite understood the interest taken in this question on both sides of the House. He was quite aware of the importance attached to it in Ireland. It was the fact that no intimation had been given to the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr Sexton), when he put his Question that day, that the Vote would be taken tonight. He (Lord John Manners) had been himself under the impression that it would not be taken; and, under the circumstances, it would be only reasonable to postpone the Vote.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

(26.) £553,781, to complete the sum for the Post Office Packet Service.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he was in a state of perfect maze as to the system which was being adopted in taking the Votes that night. He could not make out what they were voting. He would venture to ask whether they were voting Supplementary Estimates?

The CHAIRMAN: No.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: What is included in these Votes? I cannot follow the business.

The CHAIRMAN: No doubt, the Votes have been put with some irregularity; but those we are now dealing with are for the Revenue Department. We are on the Vote for the Post Office Packet Service.

Mr. WHITLEY: Does that include the Vote for Mails?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord John Manners): It is for the Packet Service.

Mr. WHITLEY said, that, a short time ago, he had represented to the Post Office authorities that the West Indian mails for the future should sail from Plymouth instead of Southampton. He regretted that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Plymouth (Mr. Stewart Macliver) was not in his place that night, for he knew that that hon. Gentleman was anxious to be present when this Vote was taken. Liverpool, Manchester, and all the towns in the North, were anxious that the mails should start from Plymouth. The late Government had assured the Committee that arrangements would be made to enable the mails to start from Plymouth, if the Post Office could see its way to make the alteration. There could be no doubt that Scotland and all the towns in the North of England were greatly interested in this matter, as the fact of the West Indian mails starting from Plymouth would materially accelerate their mercantile and business arrangements. The late Government had said that a sum would probably be included in the Estimates to enable this acceleration to be effected; but he regretted to see that there was no such provision made. He could assure the noble Lord the Postmaster General that this change was not only desired by Plymouth. It would give some places in Great Britain an accelerated mail service not only of some hours, but of as much even as a day. He hoped the noble Lord would consider the interests of the commercial classes, and yield to them by holding out some prospect—as the late Government had done—to the constituency he represented, and to towns like Manchester in the North of England, that this much desired change would be brought about.

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord John Manners) said, he could only say that, in preparing the Estimate of another year, he would pay great attention to the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Whitley). He was not aware, however, that the late Government had ever gone so far as to say they would give the increased sum of money which had been mentioned. If those of the late Government who had been responsible for these matters had been present and had replied, they would, he believed, have disputed the proposition. At any rate, there was no such sum to be found in the Votes on the present occasion. It was impossible for the present Government to say more than that, when they came to prepare the Estimates for next year, they would pay great attention to the suggestion made.

Mr. WHITLEY: Is it not the fact that in the contract there is a provision to the effect that this change can be effected?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord John Manners): Yes; in the contract, but not in the Estimate.

Colonel NOLAN said, that hon. Members on that (the Opposition) side of the House were not sure where this Vote was, or where it could be found. The subject just alluded to was one which they in Ireland had little opportunity of making themselves acquainted with, because all the foreign mails—or with only one or two exceptions—started from England. He did not think Irish Members ought to let this opportunity pass without pointing out to the Committee how Ireland was treated in this matter—without pointing out that nearly all the money spent on these mail services was spent on vessels which started from England. The whole of the expenditure—the whole of the large subsidies paid to the Steamship Companies—went to English ports. No one could go to Southampton without being struck by the immense advantage the commerce of that place derived from having these mail steamers start from there. The mere touching at Cork did not compensate for this; and he thought that as Ireland, which, owing to its westerly position, had many advantages, could despatch mails in the shortest possible time, her ports ought to be availed of as the starting place for some of the mail steamers. The adoption of such a system would confer a great advantage upon Ireland, and would let her know that she was getting her fair share of this expenditure. He wished to draw the attention of the Government to the complete neglect of Ireland in these matters, and to declare his opinion that these Votes should never be allowed to pass without a protest being made by Irish representatives.

Vote *agreed to.*

(27.) £1,259,816, to complete the sum for the Post Office Telegraphs.

Mr. TOMLINSON said, he did not know that this Vote was to be brought on to-night. He was anxious to make a statement upon it, and to urge upon the Government the desirability of their taking over the telephone systems of the country, and working them as part of the telegraphs. There could be no doubt that the telephone system was largely developing in the country. It was every day becoming more important, and it seemed certain that no complete telephone system could ever be established by any private body or Company. They had not the plant which was at the disposal of the Government; and he had no hesitation in saying that the Government alone, availing itself of the facilities and the experience it had acquired in the telegraph service, would be able to arrange a complete system of telephones. The late Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had on several occasions declared that the profits of the telegraph business were not increasing; and he (Mr. Tomlinson) ventured to say that the principal reason for that was the enormous extension of the telephone systems throughout the country. The Post Office, he was sure, would never be able to make a satisfactory profit out of the telegraphs, unless it took up the the telephones also. A number of private firms and private individuals in the country had telephones; and supposing that, in addition, there were public telephones by the aid of which people could communicate with private telephones for a small charge, it was obvious that a considerable number of persons would avail themselves of the privilege. He would not dwell further upon the matter at the present moment; but he was convinced that the opinions of many Members of the House and of an enormous number outside was that the Government should take up the telephones. In the interest of those who used this novel and useful expedient for sending messages this should be done.

Vote *agreed to.*

CIVIL SERVICE SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Class I.—Public Works and Buildings.

(28.) £5,000, Supplementary, Marlborough House.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he thought the Committee should have some little explanation of this Vote, seeing that the original Estimate for 1885-6 was £2,120, and that a Supplementary sum of £5,000 was now asked for. At the bottom of the Estimate it was stated that the Supplementary amount was required to provide more accommodation at Marlborough House. More accommodation might be wanted; but, whether or not, some explanation should be afforded by the right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works.

The FIRST COMMISSIONER of WORKS (Mr. Plunket) said, the reason of the Vote was this—that now that the family of the Prince and Princess of Wales had grown up the accommodation at Marlborough House had become altogether insufficient. Some of the children of the Royal Family who used to occupy the same rooms when they were children being obliged still to do so now that they had grown up. The Committee would see the inconvenience of that. The object of this Vote was to add some attics, in which the servants would be placed.

Vote *agreed to.*

(29.) £16,050, Peterhead Harbour.

COLONEL NOLAN said, he should like to have some explanation of this. The Vote committed them to an expenditure of £500,000. The first Vote was £16,000; but the whole harbour would cost £500,000—including the cost of the prison, which would exceed £50,000. The harbour was likely to cost more than the Estimate, so that the total expenditure might be £700,000. This was one of the harbours recommended by the Select Committee which had sat to inquire into the subject of Harbours of Refuge. He had been a Member of the Committee, by whom several recommendations had been made. He did not know were Peterhead was, but supposed it was somewhere on the East Coast. [*Laughter.*] Well, would someone tell him where it was? Where was it?

An hon. MEMBER: In Aberdeenshire.

COLONEL NOLAN said, he did not object to expenditure on this harbour; but several other harbours had been recommended.

An hon. MEMBER: This does not affect Ireland.

COLONEL NOLAN said, it was true that the Committee had recommended that some harbours should be constructed on the East Coast of Great Britain; but they had also recommended that one should be constructed at Galway. He wished to point out that if they were going, on the recommendation of the Committee, to vote money for one or two harbours in the United Kingdom, it would be a very unequal measure of justice if, at the same time, they were not going to give money for a much-needed harbour in Ireland. There should be some statement from the Government with regard to this harbour at Peterhead. £500,000 or £600,000 should not be voted without some explanation.

MR. ASHER said, that before the Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) made a statement as to this matter, perhaps he, as representing the district, might be allowed to say a word or two. The hon. and gallant Member for Galway (Colonel Nolan) was under a misapprehension in supposing that the Vote now proposed had anything to do with the recommendations of the Committee which deliberated last year in regard to the supply of harbour accommodation. This Vote was proposed, as he understood, solely in accordance with the recommendations of a totally different Committee—the Committee appointed some years ago to consider the question of the employment of convicts; and the leading idea, he apprehended, embodied in this Vote was the employment of convicts in the execution of large undertakings. The hon. and gallant Member was aware that it had been the practice for a number of years to employ convicts in the execution of public works, the reason being that it was found highly expedient to combine reformatory with penal treatment in convict prisons. There could be no doubt that the effect of the course which was adopted in this respect had been highly advantageous in the past. It had been found that if convicts were engaged on public works, they were enabled when liberated to find their way more easily amongst the industrial populations of the country, and to escape from the temptations to return to the haunts of vice frequented by them before their conviction. The Committee, which was appointed in 1882, was composed of Gentlemen who were competent to deal with this question, and they reported very strongly in favour of the system. [Colonel NOLAN: What Committee?] It was a Committee appointed by a Treasury Minute, for the purpose of "considering certain questions relating to the employment of convicts in the United Kingdom," and it was composed of Colonel Sir Edmund Du Cane, Colonel C. Pasley, Colonel Sir Andrew Clarke, Captain G. Nares, R.N., Mr. A. B. Mitford, the Hon. C. F. Bourke, and Mr. Andrew B. Bell. These Gentlemen, after a very minute investigation into the matter, reported that—

> "The employment of convicts on large public works, such as the construction of harbours of refuge, or works under some public Department, so carried on as to be conducive to the progress of their reformation and to their preparation for a return to society on the expiration of their sentence, is an essential part of our penal system."

They further said, with regard to the improvements in this respect, that—

> "The statistics of crime point irresistibly to the conclusion that they have met with most remarkable success, diminishing the number of criminals to be subjected to punishment in a degree which, perhaps, surpassed the anticipations of those who introduced them."

These statistics, which had been supplied to them, showed the very great benefit the system had been to the country; because, notwithstanding the large increase which had taken place in the population, the average number of sentences of penal servitude passed for the years 1865-9 were 2,148; whereas in 1880 they had dropped to 1,654. These Gentlemen attributed that diminution largely to the improved mode of treating the convicts by keeping them employed on large public works. Then these Gentlemen had to consider what works should be undertaken, and their attention was directed to the question of the employment of Scotch male convicts, numbering nearly 800, on some public work in Scotland. They reported that it appeared to them that these convicts could be employed with great advantage in the construction of a harbour of refuge at Peterhead. Their words were—

> "They have, however, made inquiries into various schemes for public works in Scotland which have from time to time been proposed, and they are satisfied that the most likely project for benefiting the shipping and fishing interests of the country at large, and at the same time profitably employing convicts, is the construction of a harbour of refuge at Peterhead, in Aberdeenshire."

They pointed out, at the same time, that Peterhead was the most prominent point on the East Coast of Scotland, and that—

> "From the Firth of Forth to the Cromarty Firth, a distance of 250 miles, there is no harbour to which men-of-war, merchant ships, or fishing boats can resort in the easterly gales that are so prevalent on the coast."

A Sub-Committee had also been appointed to consider the matter, and had unanimously reported in favour of the construction of a harbour at Peterhead.

Colonel NOLAN said, the hon. and learned Gentleman's (Mr. Asher's) explanation was a very clear one; but he (Colonel Nolan) wanted to point out to the Committee that here there was nearly £500,000 put aside for Scotland, and yet, although they had a Committee of the House of Commons reporting in favour of harbours in Ireland, there was no sum for Ireland included in the Votes. There was no promise, moreover, that these other harbours would ever be made. There had been a recommendation for a harbour at Galway; but he saw nothing whatever done to give effect to the recommendations either of the Committee over which the Home Secretary presided, or of the Harbours of Refuge Committee. He thought they ought to have some satisfactory assurance on this subject.

Mr. MARJORIBANKS said, that he was Chairman of the Committee which had sat on the question of Harbours of Refuge; and he thought he ought to point out that the question of convict labour was strictly outside the scope of that inquiry. The question of constructing a harbour at Peterhead was already decided upon before that Committee got to work; and they proceeded with their inquiry on the basis that harbours were to be made both at Peterhead and at Dover. He did not think that hon. Members could complain of that Committee therefore; at the same time, he was sorry that the Government had not seen their way to take the matter up more keenly.

Mr. R. PRESTON BRUCE said, the only question was that of employing a portion of the convicts—namely, the Scotch convicts—on a harbour in Scotland; and it was plain that if they were not employed at Peterhead they would have to be employed elsewhere. The Vote, therefore, imposed no new charge upon the Exchequer.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked, what did the Government propose to do for Ireland similar to that which they were now asked to vote £500,000 for for Scotland? It was well known in the House that there was a question of a harbour at a place called Mutton Harbour, at Galway, and they had had many promises in regard to it; but they had never come to anything. The Scotchmen, who were more practical than the Irishmen were, had succeeded in getting a grant of £500,000; but the Irishmen got put off with a few friendly words. He suggested that Ireland might employ the convicts which it had in making a beginning upon those works which were so much wanted.

Mr. ARTHUR PEASE said, that considerable progress had been made with the harbour at Dover, and now they heard that progress was to be made at Peterhead. He should just like to hear from the Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) what prospect there was of any works being undertaken on the North-East Coast of England? There was no harbour between the Tyne and the Humber, although there were many lives lost around that coast; and he should much like to know what prospect there was of a start being made to construct a harbour in that neighbourhood?

MR. P. J. POWER said, it was unfair that the Government should carry out the recommendations in regard to England and Scotland, and not in regard to Ireland. He thought it was only reasonable that some Gentleman representing the Government should give them some little information as to their intentions with regard to Ireland.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, the question of convicts in Galway — in fact, in the whole of Ireland—was a matter which had been referred to a Departmental Committee some years ago. They went at some length into the matter, as far as it related to England; but, unfortunately, they did not go into the question of Scotland and Ireland. That Committee had never finished their inquiry; and, in his humble opinion, he thought they ought to go on inquiring into the subject so far as it regarded Scotland and Ireland.

MR. O'KELLY said, the main question was that they wanted some money for making harbours in Ireland; and he thought it would be the duty of the Irish Members to insist on the postponement of the Vote until they got some assurance from the Government that the recommendation of the Committee would be carried out.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he must point out that the recommendation of the Prisons' Committee in Ireland — that convicts should be employed in making alterations in Mountjoy Prison—had been carried out. When that was completed, he quite agreed that the question of employing them on harbours in Ireland should be taken into serious consideration.

MR. O'KELLY said, he was sure that if the Government would only determine to construct the harbours they would have less need to build prisons. One of the reasons which made it necessary to build prisons in Ireland arose from the fact that they did not develop the resources of the country. The best thing for the Government to do was to spend some of the money which they were now spending on prisons on building harbours.

Vote *agreed to.*

(30.) £16,000, Supplementary, Disturnpiked and Main Roads, England and Wales.

(31.) £6,800, Supplementary, Diplomatic and Consular Buildings.

CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE.

(32.) £2,500, Supplementary, Revising Barristers, England.

(33.) £5,700, Supplementary, Prisons, Scotland.

CLASS V.—FOREIGN AND COLONIAL SERVICES.

(34.) £10,920, Supplementary, Colonies, Grants in Aid.

CLASS VII.—MISCELLANEOUS.

(35.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That a sum, not exceeding £350, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the repayment to the Civil Contingencies Fund of certain Miscellaneous Advances."

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he believed that this Vote included a sum of £40, in view of the expense of carrying a distinguished person across to the Continent, instead of his paying his own fare, as he ought to do. He had always voted against Votes of this sort, and he should do so again. He had made these remarks; but he understood that the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) desired to speak on the question, and he noticed that the hon. Member was out of the House for a moment when the Vote was called on.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he was very much obliged to the hon. Member, and begged to move to reduce the Vote by £40, which was the amount of the fare of H.R.H. the Duke of Cambridge between Dover and Calais. He did not know that there was any national necessity for His Royal Highness to go to Calais at all. He was not aware that there was any portion of the British Army quartered there. He could understand that in the case of the Prince of

Wales it might be a proper thing to make a charge such as this; but the Duke of Cambridge was not a son of the Crown. He was only the grandson of a Monarch; and the Committee knew that there were a great many grandsons, and if they were to go on paying for all of them in this way, the charge for fares from one place to another would be something phenomenal. Why did he want a special boat? Why did he not do the same as any other ordinary being, get into the packet, and go over, and get out in the ordinary way when he got there? It was like a man going into a restaurant to dine, and engaging the whole restaurant. He supposed that he should be told that the Queen had the right of taking a man-of-war if she liked. Well, they had been told that the Crown had the power of closing the parks; but it was said at the time that it would cost three Crowns to do it. He knew that there were abstract rights of that sort; but they could never be exercised. Now, this was a very thin House; but he wished them to consider that all those who were absent agreed with him. [*Cries of* "No, no!"] He believed that hon. Gentlemen opposite agreed with him in their hearts. He objected to this, because the working people of the country felt very strongly on the matter, and their affections were alienated when these constant attempts were made by the Government to put their hand in the public Treasury for paltry sums of this sort. He begged to move the reduction of the Vote by £40.

Motion made, and Question put,

"That a sum, not exceeding £310, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the repayment to the Civil Contingencies Fund of certain Miscellaneous Advances."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 23; Noes 60: Majority 37. — (Div. List, No. 249.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

(36.) £40,000, Registration of Voters, England.

(37.) £6,600, Registration of Voters, Scotland.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

Mr. Labouchere

CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE (No. 2) BILL.

(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Holland.*)

[BILL 223.] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he had an Amendment to move, in page 8, Clause 20, which, though dealing with a small amount, was of great importance, and he regretted having to bring it on so late at night. The case was a strong one; and he must make a corresponding appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) to accept it. He rose to move the omission, in lines 37 to 39, of the words—

"Have the meaning assigned to it by the Act of the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth years of Her Majesty's reign, chapter four, and shall also."

He thought that few hon. Members could be aware what those words imported; and he, for one, expressed the hope that they would not treat the Colonies in the way they were proposed to be treated by this Bill. In order to see what was the meaning of the words he wished to be excluded, it would be necessary to refer to the Act. It provided that the term foreign security meant and included every security for money issued by or on behalf of any Foreign or Colonial State, Corporation, or Government. It was, he said, certainly an extraordinary thing that we should have an Act of Parliament which defined Colonial Governments to be included in the term "Foreign Government." They all agreed that it was an unfortunate mode of levying this tax, and that it ought not to be repeated in future. His objection was that it was wrong in principle, and, besides that, that they were taxing loans made to the Colonial Governments, whereas they did not tax loans made to the Imperial Government. He thought they must really look upon the great self-governing Colonies as being in partnership with this country, and say that the loans made for the purpose of developing the resources of their common country, and its defences ought not to be taxed, any more than were Government loans in Great Britain. Take, for instance, the defence of the Australasian Colonies;

it would seem almost monstrous that Victoria should be obliged to borrow money in order to have her share in the protection of the Empire by naval or other means, and that we should levy a tax on such loans. It was quite true that the amount was a very small one; but the question came up indirectly—he might say almost inadvertently. The object of the clause of the Act was in itself a very good one; it was that debentures to bearer should pay as much as if they were not made out to bearer, and he supposed that the chief object which the late and the present Chancellor of the Exchequer had in view was that debenture bonds of railway or any companies should not escape equal taxation because they were not made out to bearer, as they were very often in the Colonies, and, to some extent, in England. There was no stamp on the transfer of Imperial Government Stock, and in the case of India there was no tax on a large proportion of the Debt—on £62,000,000, which was inscribed Stock; and as regarded debentures to bearer, there was a composition so trifling that it could scarcely be considered a tax at all. In his opinion, they ought to treat the loans of our great agricultural Colonies in exactly the same manner as they treated Imperial loans, or, at any rate, as they treated the Indian loans. He thought no one would dispute that statement; but, as the law stood, they would be levying a considerably larger tax on Colonial loans than upon Indian Stock. The amount in question, he apprehended, was very small indeed; and although it would be rather difficult for him to estimate it in pounds, shillings, and pence, it could, no doubt, be very easily done at the Treasury, and he could not imagine that it would make much difference to the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget. But a very considerable principle was involved here; and its importance, he had reason to believe, was much felt by the Representatives of the Colonies. Certainly, the late Government—and he almost thought the present Government—had been waited on by a deputation from the Agent General of Victoria, and from the High Commissioners of Canada, protesting against this tax, which was contrary to the principle we were more and more acknowledging, of looking on our Colonies as partners with ourselves in a great Empire.

Amendment proposed,

In Clause 20, page 8, line 37, to leave out from the word "shall" to the word "include," in line 39.—(*Mr. W. E. Forster.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) said, that the Amendment which the right hon. Gentleman had moved did not, as he thought the right hon. Gentleman had stated, in any way apply to Stock or debentures not payable to bearer, which was the general way in which the great self-governing Colonies issued their loans. The Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman simply applied to bonds to bearer. He found that, out of the total amount of Colonial loans issued in London during the last four years, only about £8,000,000 would fall under this clause; and, therefore, the amount involved, as the right hon. Gentleman had stated, was comparatively small. He confessed, however, that he concurred with the right hon. Gentleman in thinking the matter one of considerable importance in point of sentiment. No more than the right hon. Gentleman did he like the idea of looking on our Colonies in the light of Foreign States; and if, at a small cost, the Government could meet the wishes of the Colonies in this matter, they would be glad to do so. He thought there was force in the contention of the right hon. Gentleman that Colonial bonds to bearer might be placed on the same footing as Indian bonds of the same description. He had made inquiry in the matter, and he found, unfortunately, that the duty on Indian bonds was a subject of controversy between the India Office and the Treasury which had not yet been settled. Therefore, what he proposed was not to accept the Amendment, which would not only prevent the increase of the tax the right hon. Gentleman objected to, but also take away the 2*s.* 6*d.* which Colonial bonds to bearer in common with British bonds paid, but to allow the whole matter to stand over for further consideration by inserting a clause which would leave the tax of 2*s.* 6*d.* on bonds to bearer as it stood. He thought that was a fair offer, and he hoped it would meet the sentiment with regard to our Colonies which the right hon. Gentleman held in common with himself.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed,

In Clause 20, page 8, line 37, after the word "shall," insert the words "not include securities by or on behalf of any Colonial Government."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he was obliged to the right hon. Gentleman for the manner in which he had met his proposal, which he had no doubt would give great satisfaction to the Colonies and their Representatives in this country; but, in accepting the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman, he must not be understood to preclude himself personally from fully mooting the question. He meant that his contention was that Colonial loans ought not to be taxed any more than Consols.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 25 (Provision for further securing income tax on foreign and colonial dividends).

On the Motion of Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, the following Amendments made :—In page 11, line 9, after "warrants," insert "for;" in line 9, after "exchange," insert "purporting to be drawn or made in payment of;" in line 10, leave out "for;" and in line 19, at end, add—

"Provided, That this section shall not impose on any banker or other person the obligation to disclose any particulars relating to the affairs of any person on whose behalf he may be acting."

Sir EDMUND LECHMERE said, he thought there would be great dissatisfaction amongst country bankers that there should be finality about the words "not exceeding 3*d.*" It was hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have offered more liberal terms; and although those words were adopted, he trusted there might be some possibility of a larger amount of remuneration, say a minimum of 4*d.*, being allowed under certain circumstances.

Sir ROBERT FOWLER (Lord Mayor) said, that perhaps, in view of the position in which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was placed, he was justified in calling upon bankers to take a considerable amount of trouble in this matter; but he did not think he ought to do so without making the remuneration adequate.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Bill to be read the third time *Tomorrow.*

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (RETURNING OFFICERS) BILL.—[Bill 99.]

(*Mr. Attorney General, Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 14th July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. SEXTON said, that, in the absence of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy), he begged to move the following new clause :—

(Borough scale to apply to counties in Ireland.)

"In Ireland the scale applicable to a borough in the Third Schedule of the above Act shall apply also to counties, and the scale applicable to a 'county or district of a contributory borough' shall not extend to Ireland."

Clause (Borough scale to apply to counties in Ireland,)—(*Mr. Sexton,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be read a second time."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he thought that, under the circumstances of the case, it would not be reasonable to apply this to Ireland. He should be bound to oppose it.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 8; Noes 55: Majority 47.—(Div. List, No. 250.)

Mr. SEXTON said, he now begged to move the following clause standing on the Paper in the name of the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) :—

(Scale for counties and boroughs in Ireland.)

"In Ireland the following scale, which shall apply both in counties and boroughs, shall be substituted from and after the end of this present Parliament for the scale allowed by the Third Schedule of the above Act :—

Where the Registered Electors do not exceed 4,000, £100;

Where the Registered Electors exceed 4,000, but do not exceed 7,000, £200;

> Where the Registered Electors exceed 7,000, but do not exceed 10,000, £250;
> Where the Registered Electors exceed 10,000, but do not exceed 15,000, £300;
> Where the Registered Electors exceed £15,000, £400."

The hon. Member for the City of Cork had, to his (Mr. Sexton's) personal knowledge, given very close attention to this subject. The Government could hardly claim that they had given closer attention to it; and he, therefore, hoped they would accept it.

Clause (Scale for counties and boroughs in Ireland,)—(*Mr. Sexton,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he could not accept the clause.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 7; Noes 52: Majority 45. — (Div. List, No. 251.)

MR. WARTON, in proposing after Clause 2 to insert the following clause:—

> "Notwithstanding the scale of charges laid down in the First Schedule of the Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) Act, 1875, it shall be lawful in any county or borough constituency where the poll is kept open to an hour later than 4 p.m. for the Returning Officer to charge four guineas for each presiding officer and thirty shillings for each clerk at a polling station,"

said, he earnestly hoped the Government would consider this clause, because he had the deepest sense of its necessity. He would endeavour to make his argument in support of it at once as clear and as brief as he could. They all knew that under Clauses 8 to 11 of the Corrupt Practices Act any candidate who made an illegal payment was liable to lose his election, and be suspended for a long time from the privilege of serving in Parliament. They knew that an addition was made to the second part of the 1st Schedule—passed by a narrow majority during the dinner hour—in reference to Returning Officers' expenses. Formerly, candidates were allowed to pay the Returning Officer's charges; but now, if they paid more than the Returning Officers had a right to demand, they were chargeable with illegal payment. He (Mr. Warton) contended that as under the Hours of Polling Act the time during which the poll remained open had been extended from 8 to 12 hours, Returning Officers might feel themselves justified in their own consciences in charging more than they were legally entitled to. The remuneration for the Returning Officer under the old system was three guineas, and that amount had not been changed; but it seemed to him (Mr. Warton) that if three guineas was sufficient for eight hours' work, four guineas would not be too large a payment for 12 hours' work in the case of each Returning Officer, and that if £1 1*s.* had been sufficient for each polling clerk under the old state of things 30*s.* was not too much under the new. They must all have known cases where it was difficult for the scale of allowance to Returning Officers to be strictly adhered to. He was not in favour of increasing election expenses, though, taking a rough and hasty view of the matter, his Amendment would seem to be an attempt to do so. In a certain sense it would increase them, because four guineas and 30*s.* were more than three guineas and one guinea; but he contended that these increases were expedient in justice to the Returning Officers and clerks, and, of course, indirectly to the candidates, whose desire it would be to have sufficiently-paid and, consequently, efficient election officers appointed. This was not a Party question. It was one in which they were all personally interested. He maintained that, as the Returning Officers and clerks would have longer hours to serve, the difficulty of returning to their homes from outlying districts would be greatly increased, and that in cases where this led to larger expenditure on the part of these officials the candidates might be placed in the difficult position of being asked to defray that increased expenditure and to allow more than was permitted by the Corrupt Practices Act. It would be hard for the candidates to be obliged to refuse such appeals and to require the officials to pay the increased expenditure out of their own pockets.

New Clause:—

(Increase of Returning Officers' charges in certain cases.)

"Notwithstanding the scale of charges laid down in the First Schedule of 'The Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) Act, 1875,' it shall be lawful in any county or borough constituency where the poll is kept open to an hour later than 4 p.m. for the Returning Officer to charge four guineas for each presiding officer and thirty shillings for each clerk at a polling station,"—(*Mr. Warton.*)

—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be read a second time."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, it was only right the Committee should understand the view the Government took in this matter. As the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Warton) had implied, this matter was of considerable importance. Both he himself, and, he believed, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James), had received communications from Returning Officers of nearly every county in England respecting this matter; and he could not help thinking that there was a great deal in the case made by the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Warton). In the first place, the number of polling places would be largely increased in the counties; in the next place, the hours of polling were extended, the result being that it would be essential that, in many districts, the presiding officer should go down to the polling place the day before the election—especially in places where railway communication was difficult. The question was whether or not these officials should themselves bear the extra cost of discharging their duties. No one would deny that in the altered circumstances under which elections would take place, one day more, or almost one day more, than had hitherto been required would be found necessary in many cases. Then they must bear in mind the importance of keeping up to its present standard the class of men engaged to perform these duties. There was no question that men would be got at the lower scale of remuneration; but he did not think it would be to the interest of the electors of the country, or of the House itself, that a class of men should be employed on whom less reliance could be placed than on those at present appointed. It was, to a certain extent, a candidate's question; because any increase of these payments would have to be paid by the candidates. It was also an elector's question; because it was not desirable that anyone should be employed in the management of the poll who was not above suspicion. Under these circumstances, he considered that the best course for him to take, as representing the Government, would be to leave the matter to the judgment of the Committee. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Taunton had, he knew, received a deputation on this subject, and he hoped the right hon. and learned Gentleman would inform the Committee what his view with regard to it was when he was in Office. If it were determined to increase the Returning Officer's fee from three guineas to four guineas, the clerk's fee should also be increased; and he thought the proposal of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Bridport to make the fee 30*s.* instead of £1 1*s.* a proposal which might very well be accepted.

SIR HENRY JAMES said, he also thought that was a question which might be very well left to the judgment of the Committee. He considered it useless to assert a principle without listening to the very fair claims which might be made for deviation from that principle. He confessed that there had been strong arguments adduced to him, and very moderately put forward, not for any excessive increase in the payments in connection with Parliamentary elections, but in favour of an increase in one respect only. As far as the borough constituencies were concerned, he had received no request from them; and, although it was true that the hours would be longer in their case, he did not think the same difficulties would arise as would be found to exist in the counties. The payment would be the same as it was in the case of School Board elections. In the counties, however, the case was different; for, although the period the poll remained open was the same as in School Board elections, by the addition of the four hours the presiding officer would in many cases be compelled to take charge of the ballot-boxes during the night. He would have to take charge of himself and the ballot boxes, and at the time the poll closed might often find himself unable to proceed with safety and convenience to the central town where the votes would be counted. The expense of remaining where he was during the night he would have to defray himself, and the question was whether he ought not to receive remuneration for it. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General had truly remarked that the Sheriffs would be able to get someone to do the work at the present rate of remuneration; but they would be comparatively uneducated men. He quite admitted that the question was one affecting both candidates and electors. It was for county Members to say whether they were prepared to increase the expense of elections to the extent which would be required by the adoption of the proposed new clause, for the sake of securing the services of the same class of persons as those they obtained at present for the purpose of carrying on the work of the poll. For his own part, he was inclined to think that a good case had been made out for an increase in the rates of remuneration to presiding officers and clerks at county elections. The hon. and learned Member (Mr. Warton) applied his Amendment to borough elections, and he proposed the words—

> "Where the poll is kept open to an hour later than 4 p.m. for the Returning Officer to charge four guineas," &c.

This would apply only to elections which might take place between now and the General Election, and it seemed to him (Sir Henry James) that it would be better not to legislate for bye-elections in this manner. He would suggest that the hon. and learned Gentleman should alter his Amendment so as to follow the form of the Amendment on the Paper in the name of the hon. Member for Stafford (Mr. Salt), which was follows:—

> "Clause 2, at commencement of Clause, insert—'In the First Schedule to "The Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) Act, 1875," the sum of £5 5*s.* 0*d.* shall be inserted for the sum of £3 3*s.* 0*d.* for each presiding officer, and the sum of £2 2*s.* 0*d.* for the sum of £1 1*s.* 0*d.* for each clerk employed at a polling station.'"

It was with some reluctance that he said it; but he was bound to say he was, on the whole, in favour of increasing the expenses of elections to the extent he had indicated.

MR. SALT said, he was unable to move his Amendment because they had got beyond it; but if the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) would take charge of it on Report, he should be glad to hand it over to him.

MR. WHITLEY said, he was sorry to hear the remarks of the right hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir Henry James) as to boroughs, because he could assure him that the same difficulty existed in them as had been referred to in connection with counties. The Town Clerk of Liverpool felt great difficulty in this matter in consequence of the extension of the hours of polling. No doubt, the work would be easy, if it were not for the duty of taking charge of the ballot boxes at night. The polling places would be the same, and the work would be the same; but the difficulties would be greatly increased. Where 60 presiding officers were required in large boroughs, difficulty was experienced in getting respectable men to perform the duties, and that difficulty would now be increased. In past years the duties had been well performed, because it had not been difficult to get solicitors and gentlemen of a like position to act; but he was told that solicitors declined to accept the duties in future for the remuneration proposed. They would have to look forward, therefore, to getting a lower class of official, and if they did they could not expect elections to be conducted in as satisfactory a manner as they should be. In his opinion, the Amendment should apply equally to boroughs as to counties.

MR. WARTON said, he agreed with the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James) as to the desirability of leaving out of his Amendment the words "where the poll is kept open to an hour later than 4 P.M." No doubt, it was unnecessary to provide for elections which might occur before the next General Election. He knew that in certain cases candidates had had to provide for the payment to the presiding officers of sums greater than were allowed by law; and he knew that in these cases, unless this course had been adopted, the elections could not have been properly worked. He did not know whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman, in giving preference to the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Stafford (Mr. Salt), which could not be moved now, had intended to convey that he was in favour of a rather higher scale of payment to presiding officers and clerks than he (Mr. Warton) had proposed. The Amendment said—

> "The sum of £5 5*s.* 0*d.* shall be inserted for the sum of £3 3*s.* 0*d.* for each presiding officer, and the sum of £2 2*s.* 0*d.* for the sum of £1 1*s.* 0*d.* for each clerk employed at a polling station;"

whereas the amounts he had proposed were £4 4*s.* and £1 10*s.* respectively.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, that several deputations had waited upon him; but they had all come from the counties. He should be glad to ask the Attorney General whether he had received any representations from boroughs?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster): I have received no representations whatever from boroughs.

Mr. HICKS said, he should like to know exactly the position in which they stood in regard to this matter. As he had understood it, the question before them was the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton), with the omission of the reference to 4 o'clock. He had understood that Amendment to be assented to by the hon. and learned Attorney General on behalf of the Government, and by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Attorney General. If that were so, surely it was not necessary to detain the Committee with one word more.

The CHAIRMAN: The Question before the Committee is that the clause be read a second time.

Mr. SEXTON said, he was at a loss to understand the arguments in favour of the clause. He did not know whether any considerable representations had been made by these presiding officers and clerks in England on the subject; but, certainly, it was the opinion in Ireland that officials of this kind were paid well enough. A great many people, in fact, thought they were paid very well indeed. As to respectability, he did not think the extra guinea a-day would make any difference at all in the class of official who would be secured. The longest time the poll could remain open was 12 hours, and that was the working day of men of all ranks. He did not think any difficulty would be experienced in getting fitting Returning Officers at £3 3*s.*; in fact, he was sure very respectable men could be obtained for that amount. When counties were undivided, constituencies and large districts had to be traversed by the presiding officers—when some of them had to go to the polling place the day before the election, and take charge of the ballot boxes until the day after—there might have been some argument in favour of increased fees; but now that the counties were split up into districts the areas would be much smaller, and these difficulties would not exist. From the indications given by the two Front Benches, he begged to move that the Chairman report Progress.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Mr. Sexton,*)—put, and *negatived.*

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Sir HENRY JAMES said, he would now move to leave out of the clause the words "or borough." Being a borough Member himself, it would not, he thought, be considered that he was proposing anything unfair to the boroughs. The only reason he had for moving the Amendment was that the boroughs had not asked for the change, and that in their case the presiding officers and clerks would not have to face the same difficulties in the matter of travelling as would have to be faced by their brethren in the counties.

Amendment proposed, in line 3, to leave out the words "or borough."—(*Sir Henry James.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. WARTON said, he wished to make one remark about this. They were supposed to be following the law in all save the amount of the fees. Well, in the Act regulating these payments there was no distinction made between counties and boroughs; and as for the argument that greater distances would have to be travelled in counties than in boroughs, that was an argument which could have been quite as well used in 1875 as now, but evidently it had not been—or, if it had, it had been without effect. No representation had been made on this subject by those who had hitherto acted as Returning

Officers in the boroughs, for the reason that they did not intend to offer themselves for the appointments in the future. Great difficulty had already been experienced in getting respectable men to do the work at the fees given, and if this Amendment were agreed to that difficulty would be greatly enhanced.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, that, in the representations which had been made to him, one of the principal grounds for demanding these increased fees had been that it would be necessary for the officials, in many cases, to go to the polling places the day before the election in order to be present at 8 o'clock, when the poll opened, and that it would be necessary for them to wait until the morning following the polling day to return to the central town with the ballot boxes. That argument could not be said to apply to the boroughs.

MR. WHITLEY said, that if the Amendment were carried it would cause grave dissatisfaction. It was very difficult in large constituencies to get the right men to preside at the polling stations; and in the future it would be impossible if they were not to be properly paid. He trusted that those who were anxious to have elections properly conducted would vote for the clause of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) in its entirety.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 8; Noes 54: Majority 46.—(Div. List, No. 252.)

MR. SEXTON: I beg to move, after the word "constituency," in line 3, to add the words "in England."

MR. WARTON: You mean "Great Britain."

Amendment proposed, in line 3, after the word "constituency," to add the words "in England."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. TOMLINSON: If we pass this Amendment we shall exclude Scotland as well as Ireland.

SIR HENRY JAMES said, the original Act of 1875 did not apply to Scotland at all, therefore they need not shrink from excluding Scotland. As there were some hon. Members anxious to see the distinction clearly drawn, it would be well to put in the words "in England."

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

SIR HENRY JAMES: I now move to omit the words "where the poll is kept open to an hour later than 4 p.m."

Amendment proposed,

In lines 3 and 4, to leave out the words "where the poll is kept open to an hour later than 4 p.m."—(*Sir Henry James.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause," put, and *negatived.*

Words *left out* accordingly.

MR. WARTON said, he had another Amendment to move, which, not knowing that the Bill was coming on to-night, he had been unable to put upon the Paper. It was a clause to enable the Returning Officer, provided he did not exceed the legal maximum for the Returning Officer's charges, to apportion them as circumstances might render desirable. If this were agreed to, the Returning Officer might spend a little more on one item—on the poll book, clerks, legal advice, and so on—and a little less on another. It seemed only fair to extend to the Returning Officer the principle adopted in the case of the candidate, who had certain charges to pay—in respect of poll clerks, agents, printing, committee rooms, and so forth—and was allowed a maximum sum for the purpose to be apportioned as seemed desirable.

New Clause (Apportionment of Returning Officer's Charges,)—(*Mr. Warton,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read the second time."

SIR HENRY JAMES said, he had been going to make the request that the clause should be postponed to the Report stage. That was when he had not understood the proposal; but now that he did understand it he most strenuously objected to it. A Returning Officer might, if the clause were agreed to, cut down all other expenses but his own remuneration—for instance, erect insufficient polling places, or under-pay his assistants, and then keep the balance himself. No proposition could well be more objectionable.

MR. WARTON: I withdraw the clause.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. J. B. BALFOUR: I beg to move the following Amendment:—

"Schedule.

Scale of payment to deputy returning officers.

"(1.) At a contested election. For every thousand or part of a thousand electors in the constituency, £1 10*s*.

"(2.) At an uncontested election. For every thousand or part of a thousand electors, 10*s*."

This is supplementary to certain Amendments made the other day.

Amendment *agreed to*.

MR. SEXTON: I wish to move this Amendment for my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy). In Preamble, page 1, line 11, after "amount," add "and otherwise to amend the above Act."

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to*.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Question is, "That I report this Bill, as amended, to the House."

MR. WARTON: Before the Bill is reported, I wish to ask whether it will be reprinted before the next stage is taken? A great many Amendments have been made in it."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER): Agreed.

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Wednesday*, and to be *printed*. [Bill 251.]

EVIDENCE BY COMMISSION BILL.

(*Mr. Attorney General, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Secretary Stanley.*)

[BILL 238.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he wished to know what was meant by the title of this Bill? There was a reference in the title to "India and the Colonies;" but there was no allusion whatever to India in the body of the Bill itself, which was unlimited in its scope.

SIR FARRER HERSCHELL said, the explanation was that it was only in India and the Colonies that evidence could be taken by Commission.

Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported*, without Amendment; read the third time, and *passed*.

LUNACY ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr Arthur Balfour, Mr. Stuart-Wortley.*)

[BILL 244.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

SIR FARRER HERSCHELL said, he should like to know what the Bill was?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) said, it was to enable the masters of workhouses to take in lunatics, who had been wandering about the streets, for a short time.

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow*.

SEA FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT BILL [*Lords*].—[BILL 250.]

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, he wished to point out to the House that this Bill had only been delivered that morning. It was a Bill of great importance, and some of its provisions were of a very arbitrary character. It enabled the Fishery Board to prohibit fishing altogether under certain circumstances; but it contained no provision for those men whose means of livelihood might be taken away. The Committee, who had recommended the Bill, had gone altogether outside the limit of their inquiry, and had sent in a very able Report in favour of trawling; but there was no doubt whatever that there was a great wish amongst the fishermen that trawl fishing in territorial waters should be limited. He thought it was very improper that the Bill should be taken that night, when there had been no opportunity of putting down an opposition to it.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) said, he hoped that the hon. and gallant Member would not press his opposition to the second reading of the measure being taken that night. It was true that this Bill now came before the House for the first time; but it had been before the House of Lords for a considerable period, and in that way it had been before the fishing community, and it was practically a reflex of the general view on the subject of fishing. He was quite aware that there might be some opposition to some particular provisions in the Bill; but that could be gone into when the measure got into Committee. It would be a great misfortune if the Bill was not advanced a stage now, for if it were not it might not be possible to proceed further with it until next Session.

MR. MARJORIBANKS said, he would point out that he was a Member of the Committee referred to, and could say that the Bill fully carried out their recommendations with regard to steam trawling on the East Coast of Scotland. It was proved before the Committee that this trawling did a great deal of damage to the nets of the fishermen, and this Bill would do a great deal of good in preventing such damage. He hoped that the present Government would be able to replace some of the provisions which had been inserted by the late Government. He thought it might be well to give the Commanders of Her Majesty's Fleet some authority in the matter of seeing that the regulations with regard to trawling were carried out.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) said, he did not propose to go into the details of the Bill at that late hour; but he hoped that the hon. and gallant Member would not insist on his opposition. All the points he had raised could be taken in Committee, and he (Baron Henry De Worms) thought the hon. and gallant Gentleman would find that the Bill, instead of doing harm, would be exceedingly beneficial to the fishermen. If he had had time he could have convinced the hon. and gallant Member that that was so. He would point out also that the Bill was printed on Saturday. He hoped it would be allowed to go through.

MR. WILLIAMSON said, he also desired to see the Bill read a second time. It might be amended in Committee; but, on the whole, he regarded it as an honest effort to carry out the recommendations of the Trawling Committee. His hon. and gallant Friend (Sir Alexander Gordon) was afraid that the Fishery Board would have an absolute authority; but he would point out that all the bye-laws they framed had to receive the sanction of the Home Secretary before they could come into force.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, he would not oppose the second reading now; but he would give Notice that, on going into Committee on the Bill, he would move a Resolution declaring that no settlement of the question could be satisfactory that did not make some further provision in regard to fishing in territorial waters.

Bill read a second time and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

PATENT LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Sir Farrer Herschell, Mr. Holms.*)

[BILL 240.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 3, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Specifications, &c. not to be published unless application accepted).

MR. TOMLINSON said, he had no observation to make as to the clause; but he thought Progress should be reported before the clause was agreed to, because he expected that he or some other Member might have an additional clause to move.

SIR FARRER HERSCHELL said, he had no objection to reporting Progress.

Clause *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

PREVENTION OF CRIMES AMENDMENT BILL [*Lords*].—[BILL 93.]

(*Mr. Tomlinson.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

MR. TOMLINSON, in moving "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," said, that the object of the Bill was to give to the magistrates a summary jurisdiction in charges of obstructing the police in the execution of their duty. Assaults on the police could already be summarily dealt with, and he thought that the enactment should be extended to obstructing them. At present the Summary Jurisdiction Act dealt with the greater offence, but did not touch the minor one, and cases coming under the latter were necessarily sent to the Quarter Sessions.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Tomlinson.*)

MR. HOPWOOD said, it was far too late to discuss this matter. He had a great deal to say with regard to it, therefore he begged to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Hopwood.*)

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. STUART-WORTLEY) said, that although there was not much to be said against the Bill, there was not much to be said in its favour. He hoped the House would consent to adjourn the debate.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Debate *adjourned* till *To-morrow.*

SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND [SALARIES].

Committee to consider of authorising the payment, out of monies to be provided by Parliament, of the salary of a Secretary for Scotland, and of any officials who may be appointed under the provisions of any Act of the present Session for appointing a Secretary for Scotland (Queen's *Recommendation* signified) *To-morrow.*

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1883-4.

Committee to consider the Savings and Deficiencies upon the Grants for Navy and Army Services in the year ended on the 31st day of March 1884, and the temporary sanction obtained from the Treasury by the Navy and Army Departments to Expenditure not provided for in the Grants for that year, *To-morrow.*

Ordered, That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments, which were presented upon the 23rd day of February last, be referred to the Committee.

House adjourned at a quarter after Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 28th July, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Evidence by Commission * (212); Pluralities * (213); Poor Law Unions' Officers (Ireland) * (214).

Second Reading — Women's Suffrage (27), *negatived;* Medical Relief Disqualification Removal (207); Bankruptcy (Office Accommodation) * (191).

Committee — River Thames (No. 2) (171-218); Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt Practices) * (199-219).

Committee—Report—Post Office Sites * (181).

Report—Earldom of Mar Restitution * (107-217); Public Health (Members and Officers) * (194).

Third Reading—Cholera Hospitals (Ireland) * (182); Shannon Navigation * (184); Polehampton Estates * (183); National Debt *; School Boards * (200); Exchequer and Treasury Bills *; Greenwich Hospital * (201), and *passed.*

NEW PEER.

Sir Robert James Loyd-Lindsay, K.C.B., V.C., having been created Baron Wantage of Lockinge in the county of Berks—Was (in the usual manner) introduced.

ARMY—GLENCORSE MILITARY PRISON.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE MARQUESS OF LOTHIAN said, he rose to ask a Question of the noble Viscount the Under Secretary for War about the military prison of Glencorse, the condition of which he ventured two years ago to bring to the attention of their Lordships. This prison was built about 100 years ago for the reception of French prisoners taken during the war with France, and was constructed entirely of wood, except the stone staircase in the centre which connected the two wings, and the wood was tarred over. It was nothing more nor less than a fire trap. A prisoner within it once set fire to his clothing, and if the fire had spread not a single person in the prison would have escaped. His firm conviction was that if the building should take fire, as it might do at any moment, not a soul in it would escape. The prison was admirably conducted, and he was convinced that in the event of a fire the warders would do all in their power to get the prisoners out, and would fall victims to their sense of duty. He wanted to know what were the intentions of the Government with respect to the prison?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Viscount BURY), in reply, said, that this was a very important matter. The facts as stated by the noble Marquess were perfectly correct. The prison was built of wood at the beginning of the present century, or at the end of the last century, for the reception of French prisoners. It had continued from year to year, and there was no doubt that it was now absolutely unsafe. The Military Authorities did not consider that it would be desirable to retain the prisoners in the building any longer than could be helped, and they were as anxious as anybody else to get them out of this very dangerous position. The noble Marquess might therefore consider that the prison was condemned, and that as soon as room could be found elsewhere the prisoners would be removed from their present quarters. The necessary arrangements would be made as soon as possible, and the prison would be a thing of the past.

EGYPT (FINANCE) — THE INTERNATIONAL LOAN OF £9,000,000.

QUESTION.

EARL GRANVILLE: I wish to ask the noble Marquess, Whether he is able to confirm the report that the Egyptian Financial Loan has been practically settled? I shall hear that, not with surprise, because it would be quite impossible that the great statesmen who conduct the affairs of European countries should have raised any unnecessary objections to an arrangement, or the promulgation of an arrangement, that has taken so much time to complete; but, at the same time, if it is finished it will be a matter of the greatest possible pleasure and congratulation both in this country and in Egypt.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: The noble Earl is quite correct. The Egyptian Loan is being issued at this moment with the consent of all the Powers. I entirely agree with the noble Earl that as matters stand it was becoming a matter of the greatest importance to Egypt that the loan should issue. I am very glad it is issued, for I believe that it will facilitate the course of the Egyptian Government in the future. I will not go into explanations, as the matter is somewhat complicated; but I hope shortly to lay Papers on the Table which will show exactly what has been done.

GIANT'S CAUSEWAY, PORTRUSH, AND BUSH VALLEY RAILWAY AND TRAMWAYS BILL.

THIRD READING.

Adjourned debate on the motion for the Third Reading *resumed* (according to order).

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 3^a accordingly, with the amendments.

Then it was *moved*,

> "That so much of Standing Order No. 116. as requires the insertion in the Bill of provisions forfeiting in certain contingencies to the Crown money deposited under the Standing Orders, be dispensed with." — (*The Lord Ventry.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

A further amendment made to the Bill.

Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

MEDICAL RELIEF DISQUALIFICATION REMOVAL BILL.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

EARL GRANVILLE said, he wished to ask the noble Earl who was in charge of this Bill, Whether he would state to the House, in proposing the second reading, what day he intended to take the Committee, and what facility he meant to ask the House to grant him in order to hasten the decision of the House so that it would have effect at the forthcoming registration of voters? The noble Earl was probably aware that next Friday was the last day for making out the overseers' lists; but the President of the Local Government Board, in "another place," had promised, when in charge of the Bill, to introduce a clause providing that the overseers should make out supplemental lists of the claims of those who had received medical relief to be presented with the other lists to the Revising Barristers. If the Bill passed this week it would only give 24 days to the overseers to perform this duty, which he was informed was not more than sufficient. He should like to know whether the noble Earl had taken any means for the incorporation of this clause in the Bill?

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, he had to state, in reply to the noble Earl, that it was his anxious desire that the Bill should pass through that House as soon as possible. It was with that view that he came down to that House yesterday to consult the authorities as to when it was necessary that the Bill should pass in order that it might be efficacious this year. He spoke to his noble and learned Friend the Lord of Appeal opposite, as to whether it would be possible to suspend the Standing Orders.

He had every wish that the Bill should become efficacious as speedily as possible. The Question addressed to him by the noble Earl seemed to be one which ought properly to be addressed to the Leader of the House. With reference to the regrettable incident that took place yesterday evening, he might observe that nothing was further from his mind than to say anything that could be construed as implying in the slightest degree discourtesy to the noble Earl opposite. Up to last night he, in common with every other Member of their Lordships' House, had invariably received the utmost courtesy and consideration from the noble Earl. But the noble Earl put the matter as a question of right, and upon that he was afraid the noble Earl was wrong.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he would cordially reciprocate the words of the noble Earl. He did not complain that the noble Earl had put himself forward, but that he persisted in the course he had adopted when he (Earl Granville) had stated that he had been requested to take charge of the Bill by those who had conducted it through its final stages in the House of Commons. He had looked at the newspaper reports of what took place on the previous evening; and they appeared to him to entirely confirm what had been said on that side of the House. He was quite aware that the ultimate power in this matter rested with the noble Marquess; but what he wished to know was whether Mr. A. J. Balfour's advice would be taken, and for what day the Committee stage would be fixed?

The Marquess of SALISBURY said, he was sure there was every desire on the part of their Lordships to facilitate the progress of the Bill; but the course suggested by the noble Earl was somewhat unusual. The point should be raised after the second reading.

Earl GRANVILLE said, he could not agree that it was an unusual course to ask the Mover of the second reading of a Bill when he proposed to take the Committee stage.

The Earl of MILLTOWN said, he had only one remark to make, and that was with regard to the noble Earl's observation as to the report in the papers. He was of opinion that the report entirely confirmed his view of the case.

WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE BILL.—(No. 27.)

(*The Lord Denman.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

Lord DENMAN said, that this was no Party question; and if it had in the first instance been included in the Franchise Bill, in "another place," it would probably have prevented that Bill passing unchanged through their Lordships' House. It had been stated that such a Bill ought not to originate in their Lordships' House. He (Lord Denman) had endeavoured on June 23 to pass it, without discussion — that the Committee might be deferred—and any discussion, as in the Party Processions Act (Ireland), August 8, 1832—in the House of Commons—might be taken on that stage. He had never pressed forward the Bill; but when he found that it could not be proceeded with "elsewhere," he thought it right to renew it. He would never take a second reading with the understanding that it was to proceed no farther; for, in case of any conference between the two Houses on any other Bill, there might be time for its passing into law. He had presented many Petitions for it from England and Wales, from Scotland and from Ireland, and he believed not a single Petition had been presented against it; and a printed paper signed by several women of station and intelligence had been sent to every Member of their Lordships' House. He considered that the Franchise Bill was imperfect without it. There was an instance in which the grandmother—a mother of a late tenant of his—had successfully managed a farm of 400 acres as well as that tenant; and it was unjust that widows should be ejected from their farms—as Mr. Joseph Arch had stated to have been done—because they could not vote. Lady Sterling, in East Lothian, had managed her land successfully; and it was hard that her labourers should vote instead of their employer. His own wife had received a notice to give the names of all those employed on her farm, before a day which had passed. No doubt, it was late in the Session to revive a Bill of this character; but it would be better to pass it before a General Election, even if too late for registration, and he hoped that their Lordships would agree to its second reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Denman.*)

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, he thought a noble Earl opposite, who favoured the principle of the Bill, had indicated the course he should adopt with regard to this measure.

THE EARL OF ROSEBERY said, that as he thought this was an improper way of bringing forward the question, he stated that he would leave the House rather than take part in a division upon it.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, it would be unfortunate that such a course should be taken, and he, therefore, moved the Previous Question.

A Question being stated thereupon, the Question was put Whether the said Question shall be now put; *Resolved* in the *negative.*

MEDICAL RELIEF DISQUALIFICATION REMOVAL BILL.—(No. 207.)

(*The Earl of Milltown.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, as the question had been threshed out in both Houses, he would not occupy the attention of their Lordships long. The question first appeared upon the scene when the Representation of the People Bill was in Committee in the other House. On June 19 Dr. Commins moved an Amendment that voters receiving medical relief should not be disqualified, whether they received it at hospitals or otherwise. He might say there that it was a question whether this Bill would meet the case of relief granted by hospitals and dispensaries. The Amendment of last year was violently opposed by the Members of the late Government. Sir Charles W. Dilke, speaking in their name, insisted on the Amendment being withdrawn or negatived, in order, as he said, to put an end to the question. On May 6 the Registration Bill was in Committee, and an Amendment was moved by Mr. Davey to the effect that medical relief, surgical assistance, or the giving of medicine should not be deemed to constitute parochial relief within the meaning of the Poor Relief Acts. That Amendment was strongly opposed by Her Majesty's late Government, and it was negatived by 107 against 102. On May 12 the question cropped up again on the Report at the dinner hour; and, though the late Attorney General and other Members of the Government opposed the Amendment, it was carried by 87 against 50. When the Bill reached this House the late Government, who had hitherto opposed the principle of non-disqualification, did not exactly accept it, but refrained from opposing it; the support was not of a very active character. An Amendment was moved to strike out the clause, and the only Member of the late Government who supported it was the Lord Chancellor, whose principal argument was the hardship of disqualifying in rural districts for aid which in towns could be more easily obtained from dispensaries supported by voluntary contributions. *The Law Journal* said that some Revising Barristers struck off those who had accepted relief from hospitals; and, if that were so, he should propose to clear up the matter in Committee, if he could do so without risking the Bill. The Duke of Richmond said that the clause in the Bill was imperfect and unsatisfactory; he said he did not take objection to the principle; but he did object that if the least amount of medical comfort other than medicine were given to a labourer he would be disqualified. The same view was taken by his noble Friend the Prime Minister, who described the clause as a mere mockery, because it would not really enfranchise those for whose benefit it was intended, as it did not include everything which was necessary to the case of sickness under medical treatment, and was thus only a half-measure, which would lead to great disappointment. When the Bill went down to the House of Commons, the late Government, represented by Sir Charles W. Dilke, strongly supported their Lordships' Amendment, and in the division that Amendment was carried by 107 to 66. No sooner, however, was that done than Mr. Chamberlain went down to his constituents, and in a singularly unfair and audacious speech, even for him, denounced their Lordships' House and the Tory Party for having imposed a restriction upon the voter which did not previously exist, and which would disqualify one-quarter of the new constituency.

Mr. Chamberlain was a Member of the Government which brought in the Bill occasioning this disability, yet he had no word of protest against that Government; and it was not until their Lordships had rejected this imperfect clause that he found out that one-quarter of the voters would be disqualified. A more unfair statement of a case was perhaps never made by a man in the position of a Cabinet Minister. In the division in their Lordships' House there was no Party character, and to say that it was a Party division was to make an unfounded statement. Among those who opposed Mr. Davey's clause were Whig Peers, like the Duke of Devonshire and the noble Lord (Lord Monk Bretton), who, not very long ago, was President of the Local Government Board. After Mr. Chamberlain's inflammatory speech, Mr. Jesse Collings brought in a Bill which, with the exception of the last clause, was practically the same Bill as that of which he was moving the second reading. In the meantime, however, a change of Government took place, and the present Government on their accession to Office, having considered all the circumstances of the case, and knowing the immense number of agricultural labourers who would be disfranchised if it were not carried, did what the late Government ought to have done if they had been in earnest on the question—they brought forward on their own responsibility a Bill to remove the disqualification more ample than Mr. Collings's Bill; because the latter was only to last for one year, while there was no limit of time in the present Bill. But as soon as this Bill was introduced by a Conservative Government Mr. Collings discovered that it did not go far enough, and proposed that all medical relief ordered by the doctor and supplied by the parish authorities should be included. For some reason or other the Government in the House of Commons did not see their way to accept Mr. Collings's Amendment, which was first moved by Sir Sydney Waterlow and defeated by a majority of three, and then brought on again on the Report and carried by a majority of 50, and declined to be any longer responsible for the measure. Notwithstanding this, however, the third reading was moved by Mr. Collings and not opposed. At length the Bill had floated to their Lordships' House; and it appeared to him, in these circumstances, that an independent Peer like himself had at least as good a right to move the second reading as the noble Earl opposite, who had taken precisely the same course as himself on the former occasion, when he had voted against his noble Friend. The principle of the Bill was more or less accepted by both sides of the House. For his own part, he had always thought it hard to disfranchise the new voter for one of those unavoidable accidents to himself, or some member of his family, to which humanity was subject. The restriction was reasonable under the limited franchise of the Reform Act of 1832, but became serious and onerous under a system which was almost manhood suffrage. He, therefore, thought that the restriction ought to be freely and unreservedly removed. But he was surprised that Mr. Gladstone's Government, which was fully aware of all the facts of the case, never did anything of the kind. In these circumstances, he moved the second reading of the Bill, which, with the exception of the last clause, was absolutely the Bill of the Conservative Government. That last clause was a matter of detail, but of necessary detail. This being the Bill of a Conservative Government, it was more right, meet, and just that a Member of the Conservative Party in that House, however humble, should take it in charge than the noble Lord, who was a distinguished Member of the Cabinet which over and over again persistently and consistently opposed the principle upon which it was founded.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Earl of Milltown.*)

Lord BALFOUR said, that he would not divide the House against the second reading; but as he had moved the recision of Mr. Davey's clause, it was right for him to say that he still thought the disqualification ought to be retained, and that he had heard no argument in favour of the Bill which would induce him to change his opinion. He admitted, at the same time, that, to a considerable extent, the situation had been changed. The matter had been again before the other House of Parliament on more than one occasion, and the decision arrived at by a snap division on the former occasion had been affirmed more than once. Therefore, he thought that, as this was a matter which affected the privileges of, or at any rate the mode of electing, Members to the other House of Parliament, that was a fact which ought to have some weight with their Lordships in dealing with this subject. On the other hand, he must say that he deeply regretted the decision which had been come to. He would not say a word on the history of the question, as the whole speech of the noble Earl who spoke last was a history of the Bill, and latterly a justification of the course he had himself pursued. He had nothing to do now with either of those questions; but he noticed that the noble Earl did not say a single word in favour of the principle of the Bill. It was easy to cite cases wherein the existing law might work hardship; but, even taking those individual cases at their worst, they would only disqualify a man for a single year, and he would afterwards regain his independence. Therefore, he did not think those cases supplied any justification for passing the Bill. By this Bill they would be teaching the working classes a lesson of improvidence. They would be teaching them that thrift was not to be valued for its own sake, and that they need not make provision for those accidents of life which were so common. It was unfortunate that a lesson should be taught to them in this way by Parliament. If they were to have medical and surgical relief out of the rates, that would have the effect of enabling them to work for lower wages. It appeared to him that the words in the 4th clause were too wide, and that no check was given on the discretion of the medical officer. He did not think that was a safe thing, and he regretted the extension which was given to the clause. At the same time, he did not think any distinct line could be drawn between brandy supplied as an article of diet to a sick man and bread supplied to him at a later stage in the progress of his recovery. This, however, afforded not an argument in favour of the clause, but rather an argument that the law ought to be left as it stood. On the last occasion he directed their Lordships' attention to the fact that this Bill would have scarcely any effect in Scotland; but he would not dwell upon that point now. In England he believed the effect of it would be to place greater difficulties than at present existed in the way of in the way of benefit and provident societies. There was one matter where he thought the present state of the law would have operated to produce a serious hardship. A man might have received relief for the past 12 months without realizing that that disfranchised him under the combined action of the Act passed last year and the clause of the Reform Act of 1832. Consequently there might be a reason for suspending the operation of that disqualification, and he should like to see a clause introduced in Committee limiting the operation of the Bill to a certain period of years. He deemed it desirable not to go further in this evil direction than was absolutely necessary. He would now call the attention of the noble and learned Lord on the Woolsack to one point in regard to the 4th clause. The last words of that clause only exempted people from the present disqualification when they had received medical or surgical assistance at the expense of any poor rate. He believed he was right in saying that this disqualification was first made part of the Statute Law by the 36th section of the Reform Act of 1832, which provided that no one should be entitled to vote who had received parochial relief or other alms. He believed the legal decisions were to the effect that "other alms" would operate to disqualify a man who had received assistance from hospitals and such like charities. If this was so, this Bill would allow a man to vote if he had received medical assistance out of the rates, but not if he had received the same assistance from private charity. This was a point which ought to be considered in Committee. In conclusion, the noble Lord said he would in Committee move an Amendment limiting the operation of the Bill to a certain time, and that he would then state the arguments in favour of his proposal.

EARL GRANVILLE said, the noble Earl (the Earl of Milltown), who had taken charge of this Bill under a deep sense of responsibility, had, as the noble Lord who followed him justly said, not advanced, in the course of a speech of half-an-hour's duration, a single argument in favour of the principle of the Bill, the second reading of which he had moved. He did hear the noble Earl for a long time rather ostentatiously

My concern rather is to show that this Bill is much larger than it looks, and the matters with which it deals are much more important than appears on the surface. In view of the prospects of the future, we held that this was not an affair on which we could engage our Ministerial responsibility, because of the magnitude of the questions which might ultimately arise. I do not propose, my Lords, to ask you to stop this Bill, or to object to the Amendment which has been made in it. I have no objection to the immediate operation of the Bill. The idea that these voters will be particularly hostile to the Party to which I belong I do not believe. My impression is they will be rather in our favour. My objection is simply on account of the questions which the Bill may raise. But your Lordships have, I think, generally pursued the policy of not interfering in those questions, which, in a broad sense, I call questions of corrupt practice, with the decisions to which the House of Commons may have come. Of course, your Lordships have a right to interfere, and would if you had good cause to do so; but this is a matter which so affects the House of Commons that, as in the case of the Corrupt Practices Bill three years ago, although I objected to that measure, I dissuaded your Lordships from intervention. In the present case, where a great political feeling wholly out of proportion to the importance of the question has been created, it would be unnecessary, and would produce unnecessary friction between the two Houses, if your Lordships rejected the Bill. I have no intention of advising you to do so, and I have expressed my belief that the immediate effects of the Bill will not be injurious; but as to its ultimate effect I must confess I have some little anxiety, and your Lordships must prepare yourselves for the questions which you will undoubtedy have to face in the future.

The Earl of SELBORNE said, the noble Earl who moved the second reading of the Bill (the Earl of Milltown) seemed to address a considerable part of his speech to a justification of his theory that the Bill ought not to be in the hands of a Member of the late Government, because they had declined at the outset to deal with the question on the Registration Bill. The simple history of the matter was this. The Registration Bill was a matter of immense importance, and a measure which it was necessary to pass through the House quickly. There was, therefore, not unnaturally an indisposition to have it encumbered with any Amendment which might cause delay, and some who on a different occasion would have thought the Amendment with respect to medical relief well worthy of consideration objected to it in this instance upon the ground which he had stated. That must have been the reason why, in the House of Commons, there was no anxiety in the first instance to introduce this measure. When the Bill came up to their Lordships' House, with the clause about which so much had been said in it, the position of the matter changed; and the Government had not, as a reason for opposing it, that they feared to encumber the Bill with such a proposal. He did his best to prevail upon their Lordships to accept the clause; but he did not succeed in retaining it in the Bill, and the Government did not subsequently desire to imperil the Bill by insisting upon its re-insertion, or to delay it while a contest between the two Houses was proceeding. The late Government allowed the matter to rest; but these facts could not be brought as charges against their consistency. The noble Marquess was alarmed at the possible consequences of the principle now introduced, and he evidently thought it was a somewhat dangerous experiment. He was not at all disposed to impute motives; but it appeared to him that if anybody had that day made a speech against the Bill, it was the noble Marquess himself. This, no doubt, was because he never could state objections without doing so in a more forcible manner than anybody else. The noble Marquess, however, had exercised a very sound judgment in determining not to advise their Lordships to oppose the Bill; but what was very remarkable about the whole controversy, and what he could not understand, was the action of the Government. The noble Marquess had urged against Mr. Davey's clause in the Registration Bill that it was impossible to draw a satisfactory distinction between medicine and medical comforts; and yet when his Colleagues introduced the principle of exempting medicine, and were asked to carry it, to what the noble Marquess had confessed was the logical conclusion, the Government declined all further responsibility for the Bill. The true explanation of the matter was to be found in the fact that throughout double motives had been operating. He did not use those words in a bad sense; but while there were doubts about the economy of the matter, there were greater doubts about the political necessity or wisdom of disfranchising the people concerned. The result of the speech of the noble Marquess was—"I do not like the measure, but I think I ought to support it."

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL said, he was a little astonished to hear the speech of his noble and learned Friend (the Earl of Selborne), since the ambiguity which he had charged against the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) was quite as pronounced on those as on the opposite Benches. In all his public life, he (the Duke of Argyll) had never known a case in which the public speeches and the private conversation of men on both sides so widely differed. He was afraid, however, that this was a characteristic instance of the present condition of politics. It was impossible to separate this measure from its history. His noble Friend on the Front Opposition Bench said that the disqualification of voters for accepting parochial relief was quite rational when the franchise was high; but that now it was lower, it was unreasonable to exclude from the franchise men of the labouring classes whose income was not sufficient to provide them with medical relief. That was the best argument he had heard in favour of the Bill; but, being the best, what did it come to?

EARL GRANVILLE: I did not use any such argument.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL said, he had heard the noble Earl distinctly say—"Now when you have lowered the franchise."

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN admitted that he had used the argument referred to.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL said, that if he were in a Court of Justice he could swear that Earl Granville had used it.

EARL GRANVILLE said, his argument was, that as the receipt of medical relief did not act as a disqualification in burghs and towns, it ought not to disqualify in the case of agricultural labourers.

THE DUKE OF ARGYLL, admitting the correction, said, that was a good argument so far as it went; but the tendency, he was afraid, would be to push it further, and the next thing would be that those who received outdoor relief would be entitled to vote. Now, he contended that in such legislation as this there was a serious danger of breaking down the principle of the new Poor Law, which was one of the greatest triumphs that had ever been secured by the Liberal Party, or rather the Whig Party. They were dealing with a delicate question, and there was not only great danger of upsetting that principle, but also of destroying the manliness and self-reliance of the poor, as well as the safety of the country itself. He quite agreed that this was a question upon which the House of Lords ought to give way to the deliberate opinion of the House of Commons; but he was of opinion that their Lordships had not before them the deliberate opinion of the House of Commons—at least, a House in a condition to form and give a deliberate and independent judgment. A little band of men in the House of Commons, numbering 25, voted against the Bill; and looking at their arguments, he saw clearly that, as political arguments, the balance was in their favour. They were gallant and independent men, who, in the face of a political majority composed of both Parties, would not consent to abandon the political convictions of their lives because of the fear of a General Election. It had been stated that the late Government, in opposing Mr. Davey's clause, merely wished to pass the Registration Bill through the House as soon as possible. The noble and learned Lord must know that at that time the opinion of the Government was against the principle of the proposed Amendment. He looked with extreme suspicion upon the fact that the principle of the Poor Law, which was most important to the independence of the poor, was given up by the Leaders of the two Parties merely from political motives, and in the face of a General Election. He could not help thinking that both Parties were mistaken. He was not at all sure that this amendment of the law was as popular as it was supposed to be. The great majority in the constituencies were ratepayers; they had to look to their selfish interests; and it was at least possible that they might view with alarm what they might regard as a plan for the increase of outdoor relief through the infringement of the principle of the Poor Law. In Scotland, he believed, it was not legal to give medical relief to those who were not already on the poor rate; and, therefore, in Scotland the Bill would have no operation at all, and the clauses referring to Scotland might as well be left out. He resented it as an injustice that the Leaders of the two Parties should bandy words in trying to prove that one Party or the other was inconsistent, when they knew that the objections to the Bill were general on both sides. He believed that if the House of Commons could have voted by ballot, this Bill would have been thrown out. Both Parties had submitted to what they regarded as a political necessity; but he did not believe that such a necessity existed.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Viscount CRANBROOK) said, he heard the arguments of the noble and learned Lord opposite in introducing the Registration Bill, and he was convinced by those arguments to an extent even further than they went. An opinion seemed to prevail that as soon as anyone received relief he ceased to be a voter. There never was a greater delusion; the man remained a voter until he was struck off the list. A man might have been receiving relief for 11 months and still be on the register. If he were, he voted; hence many were brought out of the workhouses to vote, the only question asked of them being whether they were the persons on the register. Therefore, under the present state of the law, they had this anomalous state of things, that a man might have had parochial relief for 11 months out of the 12 preceding the election, and yet keep his vote; while, on the other hand, if a man received a day's relief just before the revision, even although he might have maintained himself for a year, his name was struck off. That was a state of things which was not reasonable, and unless they were prepared to go the length of making it penal for a person who had received relief within the year to vote, he did not see how they could consistently maintain the present state of things. For these reasons, he had never taken the view of the question that others had done, and he believed it was a mistake to suppose that the effect of the Bill would be to put many on the register in proportion to the total number of voters. When all those who had been relieved after the registration could vote, why should they disfranchise those who had received relief before the registration? A man who had been convicted as a criminal, if he had served his sentence, could be restored to his position as a voter; and why should the recipient of relief be in a worse position? If a man were out on bail, waiting for judgment it might be for a serious offence, he could vote if his name were on the register. When criminals might vote, it was childish to attempt to stop this Bill because of some apprehension as to what was to follow. If anything followed it would follow justly in view of the facts he had stated; and therefore he hoped the Bill would be passed as an initiative.

LORD DENMAN said, he had not voted against the Motion of the noble Lord (Lord Balfour) to disqualify on account of medical relief, from respect to the opinion of a noble Duke now absent (the Duke of Richmond), expressed in 1879; but he had spoken against the recent disqualification, as the Franchise Bill enlarged the number of voters and Boards of Guardians, and the Auditor of the Local Government Board could control the action of the medical officers, who only could order such stimulants as were absolutely necessary—with medicine—to cure disease. They could not order bread—the receipt of which pauperized a man— and it was only ordered by the Guardians. He found that there was great disinclination on the part of the poor to apply for medical relief, because it was known that the parish officer was paid by a salary, and a preference was given to medical men, who, he was bound to state, were very moderate in their charges to the sick.

LORD BRAMWELL said, he had voted against this proposal when it was last before their Lordships, and he should certainly do so again if any opportunity were offered by way of an Amendment postponing the second reading of the Bill. He still held to the opinion that the measure was contrary to the interests of those principally affected by it—the poor themselves.

It was important that every effort should be made to teach them thrift and economy. They ought to be impressed with the belief that there was something not creditable in the receipt of parochial relief in any shape. There was no distinction between the man who received medical relief and the man who received sustenance; neither had made provision for the calamity of sickness, accident, or loss of employment. The cases of the two were identical. If he could disqualify the recipients of alms he would be glad to do it. The labourer could join a club, and the same argument which applied to medicine applied equally to food. The decent working man who wanted medicine or who fell out of work would be trusted by the shopkeeper and receive help in other ways. In this matter there was no real distinction between the rural and the urban labourer. He agreed that this was not strictly a matter of political economy, but that science had to deal with the question of the reasonableness of State relief to poverty and with the safeguards which ought to be provided against the abuse of that relief. He would refer their Lordships to some remarks of the late Professor Jevons, whom none could charge with want of kindness and sympathy for the poorer classes. In his *Methods of Social Reform*, Mr. Jevons strongly commented on the danger of allowing our working people, who were already too prone to improvidence, to entertain the idea that they might make merry in good times and fall back on the Poor Law in adversity; and he laid down the proposition that no labourer was solvent who did not lay by enough to meet the expenses of the ordinary illnesses which befell himself or any member of his family. The late Mr. Fawcett, too, in his *Manual of Political Economy*, p. 298, expressed the opinion that the Government in entering so far upon the path of Socialism as ultimately to guarantee subsistence to every citizen was incurring a great responsibility unless adequate safeguards against abuse were provided. He would also commend to their Lordships' earnest attention the letter of Dr. Alfred Carpenter, of Croydon, which appeared in *The Times* of that day. He believed the matter was really of small importance, and would only affect some two or three votes in the 1,000; but he would, nevertheless, vote against the Bill if he had the opportunity. He believed the noble Viscount opposite was perfectly accurate in his law and facts with respect to persons in the workhouses and felons. Of course, the right method was to get such persons off the register. In so far as the Bill operated at all, it would operate to the discouragement of thrift, and on that ground he was opposed to it.

LORD FITZGERALD said, he would venture to suggest to the noble Earl (the Earl of Milltown) that, as time was pressing, he should give Notice to move the suspension of the Standing Order which prohibited two stages of a Bill being taken on the same day. There were only two unimportant Amendments, and the Committee stage might be negatived, so that the Bill might be reported without Amendment. These Amendments could then be moved on the third reading. In his opinion, these stages should be taken on Thursday.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, that the noble Lord behind him (Lord Balfour) had a new clause to propose, and he himself had to move an Amendment. In these circumstances, he should take the Committee on Thursday; but thought it would be convenient and more in accordance with the usual procedure to move the suspension of the Standing Order on Friday, so that the Report and the third reading might be taken on that day and the Amendments printed, with a view to their Lordships having time to consider them.

EARL GRANVILLE asked whether the House could not sit on Wednesday? He thought it desirable, with the view of giving the overseers time to make up the lists, that there should be no delay.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, he did not believe the overseers would have any difficulty in performing their duty. He was rather inclined to protest against the practice of hustling measures through the House, as there was a very objectionable tendency to hurry Bills through Parliament. In the present case there was no necessity for departing from the usual course, and he thought the proposal of his noble Friend was a reasonable one.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Thursday* next.

RIVER THAMES (No. 2) BILL.—(No. 171.)

(*The Lord Mount-Temple.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee."—(*The Lord Mount-Temple.*)

VISCOUNT BURY explained certain alterations which he desired to see introduced into the Bill.

LORD MOUNT-TEMPLE, explained that the Conservancy would have authority to remove boats that now remained for months opposite to private houses to the annoyance of the residents.

Motion *agreed to;* House in Committee accordingly.

Clauses 1 to 3, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Right of navigation to include anchoring and mooring).

Amendments made.

Moved, "To leave out the Clause as amended."—(*The Lord Clinton.*)

On Question, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill?"

Their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 7; Not-Contents 6: Majority 1.

Resolved in the *affirmative.*

Clause 5 *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Provision for preventing annoyance to riparian owner).

Amendment *moved*, in page 2, line 37, in lieu of ("seven days") omitted, to insert ("forty-eight hours.")—(*The Earl of Abingdon.*)

On Question? Their Lordships *divided:*—Contents 4; Not-Contents 17: Majority 13.

Resolved in the *negative.*

Clauses, as amended, *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to,* with Amendments.

The Report of the Amendments to be received on *Thursday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 218.)

LAW AND POLICE—THE INTERNATIONAL CLUB.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS, in rising to ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether, seeing that certain members of the Metropolitan Police Force have been committed by the stipendiary magistrate of the Marlborough Street Police Court for trial at the approaching sessions of the Central Criminal Court for unlawfully assaulting certain members of the International Club, and seeing that, owing to want of funds on the part of the prosecutors, the prosecution is likely to fall through, Her Majesty's Government will take such steps as may be necessary to prevent a possible miscarriage of justice? said, the facts of the case were already well known to the public. He had been asked by some working men's clubs to take the matter up, and he did so. The International Club, though it might be a Socialistic body, was, as long as its members obeyed the law, as much entitled to the protection of the law as Brooks's, the Carlton, the Reform, or any other club frequented by the rich. He applied to the Home Secretary to have the police who had been committed for trial by Mr. Newton prosecuted at the public expense, and the Home Secretary informed him that the matter was no longer in his hands, and that there was a Public Prosecutor, whose right it was to determine whether there should be a prosecution, and if so, whether the State should pay the expense of it. He then applied to the Public Prosecutor, and the answer he received from that gentleman seemed somewhat inconsistent with the statement of the Home Secretary. [The noble Earl read the answer, which was to the effect that the Public Prosecutor had received instructions from the Home Office that he was to undertake the prosecution of the summonses taken out by the police, and, should the necessity arise, to defend them.] Now, he made this appeal to the Government on two grounds. One was the confidence which the public had in the police. It was well known how admirably they did their duty, and how seldom one heard of any charge being brought against them. But the public ought to know that there was no divinity which hedged round the policeman if he misconducted himself. His other ground was the justice of the case. This club stood on the same footing as the Carlton or the Reform, and there should be equal justice for the poor man and the rich.

THE PAYMASTER GENERAL (Earl BEAUCHAMP) said, his answer would be very simple. The matter was considered by the Home Office very carefully in May last, and the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt) then instructed the Public Prosecutor to take up the case on behalf of the police and to defend them. He did not see any discrepancy between the statement of the Secretary of State and the answer given by the Public Prosecutor, who very naturally was reluctant to do something which would have the effect of reversing the action he was instructed to take in May last. The noble Earl put his appeal on the ground of equal justice. But their Lordships would be very much surprised if the police made a foray upon the Carlton or the Reform, that the Secretary of State should be called upon to prosecute them at the public expense, on the ground of equal justice to rich and poor. They were told that the members of the International Club were poor men. As individuals, no doubt, they might be poor; but when they were considered in the aggregate there could not be any serious difficulty in their procuring funds for conducting the prosecution. Therefore, he did not think that the allegation of injustice was borne out by the facts of the case. The matter had been considered by the late Secretary of State, and it had also been carefully considered by the present authorities at the Home Office, and they had not been able to satisfy themselves that there was any reason why they should adopt the unusual course of undertaking the defence of the police on the one hand, or, on the other hand, of paying the expenses of this prosecution. The circumstances must be most exceptional and unusual to justify a course like that, and the Secretary of State did not feel himself called upon to adopt the very unusual course suggested by the noble Earl.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said, that the case was now different from what it was in May, as the police had been committed for trial.

House adjourned at a quarter past Eight o'clock, to Thursday next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 28th July, 1885.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART, Vote 18; CLASS III.—LAW AND JUSTICE, Vote 31.

Resolutions [July 27] *reported.*

PRIVATE BILLS (*by Order*)—*Considered as amended*—Belfast Central Railway (Abandonment)*; Southampton Corporation.*

Withdrawn—Southwark and Vauxhall Water.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Expiring Laws Continuance* [247].

Committee—Report — Third Reading — Lunacy Acts Amendment [244]; Metropolitan Police Staff Superannuation* [246]; Patent Law Amendment* [240], and *passed.*

Report — Elementary Education Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.)* [228]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Public Health Act) (No. 2)* [212].

Third Reading—Customs and Inland Revenue (No. 2)* [223], and *passed.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

SOUTHWARK AND VAUXHALL WATER BILL [*Lords*] (*by Order*).

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

COLONEL MAKINS said, he thought it would save the time of the House if he stated what the promoters intended to do in regard to this Bill. He was informed by the promoters of the Bill that although they were fully aware of the great urgency of the matter, they were also aware of the difficulties in which they would be placed in carrying out the duties imposed upon them by Parliament in the face of the opposition which had been raised to the progress of the Bill. No doubt, it would be for the interests of the consumers that the Bill should be passed; but looking to the period of the Session at which they had now arrived, and that there was still a possibility that the Standing Orders of the House would not be suspended, the promoters had come to the conclusion that they would best consult the convenience of the House, and best show their respect to it, by not persevering with the Bill. He proposed, therefore, to move that the Order for the second reading of the Bill be read and discharged. If any difficulty should arise to the consumers in consequence of a deficiency in the supply of water, he hoped it would be clearly understood that the blame would not rest upon the Southwark and Vauxhall Company, who had done their best to make provision for the wants of the locality by legislation. If any difficulty did arise, and complaints were made of an inadequate supply, the House must bear its full share, and a very large share, of the blame. But considering the period of the Session, and of the probability that the progress of the Bill would be resisted at every stage upon the Standing Orders of the House, he thought it would not be fair to the House to take up more of its time. He, therefore, begged to move that the Order for the second reading of the Bill be read and discharged.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Order for the Second Reading of the Southwark and Vauxhall Water Bill [*Lords*] be read and discharged."—(*Colonel Makins.*)

Mr. FIRTH said, he should have allowed the Motion for the withdrawal of the Bill to be made without any observation if it had not been for one remark which had fallen from his hon. and gallant Friend. While he was perfectly ready to take a full share of the responsibility for the rejection of the Bill, he could not concur in the statement which his hon. and gallant Friend had made in reference to the necessity for the Bill so far as the interest of the consumers who were to be served by it were concerned. In refuting that statement, he (Mr. Firth) would not rest the matter upon his own opinion, but would cite an authority which he believed his hon. and gallant Friend would at once accept. When the Bill was brought into the House of Commons last year for the supply of Wimbledon, the promoters, through their counsel, stated that the object of the Bill was to extend the limits of supply of the Southwark and Vauxhall Water Company.

> "That," said the learned counsel, "is the sole object of the Bill. It seeks no capital powers whatever. It simply seeks statutory authority for doing that which for the last 30 years has been done without."

That was to say, that it sought simply to continue under Parliamentary powers for providing a supply which for 30 years it had provided without such Parliamentary powers. He would refer to another authority which his hon. and gallant Friend would also accept. Evidence in support of the Bill was given by Mr. Knight, who stated that for some years he had been Chairman of the Southwark and Vauxhall Water Company. Mr. Knight was asked by the Chairman of the Committee—

> "Are you able to supply the higher level with greater facilities than the Lambeth Company?"

And the answer to that question was—

> "At the time when the arrangement was made I believe the Lambeth Company could not give that supply at all, and we did it for them. But I believe that now the Lambeth Company would be able to give that supply if they were asked."
>
> "You have been doing it?—Yes, we have done it"—

therefore they did not require capital to enable them to do it—

> "and we have done it very efficiently and very satisfactorily for the last five or six years since I have been connected with the Company."

Then followed a question to which he (Mr. Firth) wished particularly to draw the attention of his hon. and gallant Friend, because he was satisfied that his hon. and gallant Friend would not seek to impeach any statement of the Chairman of the Company.

> "In order to supply these districts efficiently, is it necessary for you to seek any fresh capital powers of any kind?—Not a penny.
>
> "Have you both plenty of money and plenty of water within your statutory powers?—Yes, ample. We have ample capital, and we have a surplus of something like 8,000,000 gallons of water per day beyond what we are distributing. We are now distributing 17,500,000 gallons, and we can and have distributed 25,000,000 gallons per day. We have effected a saving by preventing waste."

In reply to further questions, Mr. Knight stated that the powers asked for were required for Wimbledon in order to prevent waste, and, he added, that a constant supply, with a proper system of waste prevention, tended to diminish the consumption. Then, as to the question of urgency, Mr. Shiress Will, who appeared for the Wimbledon Local Board, said—

> "I am here on behalf of the Local Authority to say that there is nothing in the local requirements of Wimbledon as regards water which is so urgent that you should be asked to pass this Bill, or which is urgent at all."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order! I must remind the hon. Gentleman that the

Motion before the House is that the Order for the second reading of the Bill be read and discharged. It is quite irregular to discuss the merits of the Bill upon such a Motion.

MR. FIRTH said, he accepted the ruling of the Chair. He had only been anxious to point out, in answer to the remarks of his hon. and gallant Friend, that the counsel who represented the Wimbledon Local Authority declared that there was no urgency in the matter whatsoever.

COLONEL MAKINS: This year?

MR. FIRTH: No; the statement was made last year. If the debate had gone on he should have been prepared to show that the circumstances were the same now, and that the Bill had been brought before the House at an unfortunate moment.

Question put, and *agreed to*.

Bill *withdrawn*.

QUESTIONS.

——o——

EGYPT—MISSION OF SIR HENRY DRUMMOND WOLFF.

MR. M'LAREN asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he can give the House any further information as to the mission of the Right honourable Member for Portsmouth; and, whether he will lay the terms of his instructions upon the Table?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH): My right hon. Friend the Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) will be accredited to His Majesty the Sultan on a special Mission with reference to the affairs of Egypt, and in the execution of the same Mission he will subsequently proceed to Egypt. Her Majesty's Government have to deal with, and, as far as may be, to settle, several grave and difficult questions in regard to that country which are still undetermined. The territories placed under the Khedive by the Firman of 1879 must be protected from the recurrence of the disturbances to which in recent years they have been exposed, and must be assured in as great a degree as possible the blessings of good government and of peace. It is in the execution of this duty that Her Majesty's Government have resolved upon sending out my right hon. Friend; but it is not usual to lay on the Table beforehand the instructions given to an Envoy going to a foreign country.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Will the right hon. Gentleman be good enough to say whether we shall have an opportunity of discussing the policy of the Government in this matter, and whether he will give us an opportunity by putting down the first stage of the Appropriation Bill at such an hour that a debate could take place upon it?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: We shall be anxious to afford every facility, and I rather anticipated that some discussion of the kind would arise on the Appropriation Bill.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

MR. WEBSTER asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, having regard to the necessity of ample time being afforded for the discussion of the Universities (Scotland) Bill, the prospect of prolonged opposition to its provisions, and the advanced period of the Session, he will now see fit to announce, for the convenience of the House, that the Bill will not be proceeded with this Session? The hon. Member, observing that the Chancellor of the Exchequer was not yet present, said he should postpone the Question till he saw the right hon. Gentleman in his place.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): Will the hon. Member allow me to say that if this Bill does not go through it will certainly be due to the opposition of the hon. Member himself, who will have to account for it to the people of Scotland.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH), having now arrived in his place, said: Looking to the list of Bills on the Paper, and to the opposition of the hon. Member and some other Members from Scotland, I am afraid we cannot hope to proceed with this Bill.

MR. WEBSTER was understood to ask whether he was to accept this as a final answer?

[No reply.]

NAVY—THE EVOLUTIONARY SQUADRON—H.M.S. "AJAX."

MR. BERESFORD (for Lord HENRY LENNOX) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether his attention has been called to the facts stated in *The Daily Telegraph* of the 20th July, by its Correspondent with the Evolutionary Squadron, that, during the recent Naval practice, H.M.S. *Ajax* behaved in an extraordinary manner, her helm appearing at times to lose all command of her, and that a serious collision with H.M.S. *Agincourt* was only averted by that ship backing astern at full speed; whether it is true that H.M.S. *Ajax*, although one of our most recent ironclads, is not a safe ship to manœuvre with a squadron, when going at any but the lowest rate of speed; and, whether, if this statement be true, the sole responsibility for such constructive blunder rests with the Constructive Department at Whitehall; and if, under such circumstances, he will take steps at once to reorganise that Department?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON): A statement to the above effect, purporting to come from the Correspondent to *The Daily Telegraph* with the Evolutionary Squadron, was seen by me; but, as no official Report on this point has reached the Admiralty, I attach little importance to such a statement unless supported by trustworthy evidence and report. I am informed by Sir Geoffrey Hornby that the *Ajax*, up to the speed at which she has been tried with the Evolutionary Squadron—namely, about 10 knots—is not considered to be an unsafe ship to manœuvre with a squadron.

SIR JOHN HAY asked whether Sir Geoffrey Hornby had expressed an opinion whether going at a speed beyond 10 knots the *Ajax* was a safe ship?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY: She has not been tested beyond 10 knots.

THE ADMIRALTY—A PERMANENT FINANCE LORD.

MR. BERESFORD (for Lord HENRY LENNOX) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he is aware that much disappointment prevails in the public mind at his declaration that he was not prepared to take any steps towards the appointment, as Permanent Finance Lord, an independent financier, with the view of securing an effectual financial control over our Naval expenditure in the future; whether there be in the terms of the Patent of 1869, under which Boards of Admiralty are now constituted, anything to render illegal the appointment of a Permanent Finance Lord; and, if so, what that objection is; whether it is contemplated that Sir Gerald Fitzgerald, recently appointed Accountant General of the Navy, shall, as the chief of one of eight Departments at the Admiralty, in addition to the multifarious duties already devolving upon his present office, be called upon to undertake the onerous and responsible duty of endeavouring to institute and continue effectual financial control over the seven other Admiralty Departments?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON): I am not aware that there is any wish on the part of the public that an independent and permanent Finance Lord should be added to the Board of Admiralty. On the contrary, with the exception of two articles advocating this proposal, evidently written by the same person, in two weekly papers, I have not read or received a single opinion favourable to such a suggestion. There is no insuperable legal obstacles to the appointment of such an official; but the self-evident objection to the proposal is that if the First Lord of the Admiralty is associated with an independent and permanent Colleague, who is to control the finance of the Navy, this official, and not the Parliamentary Representatives of the Department, will be responsible for the expenditure sanctioned and incurred. The Accountant General of the Navy is at present the only permanent official charged with the duty of checking and controlling the expenditure of all the Departments of the Admiralty, and, if his duties are to be properly performed, it is clear that he must be invested with such authority as will enable him to effectively discharge his duties.

THE ROYAL UNIVERSITY OF IRELAND—EXAMINATIONS.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, In what subjects the Senate of the Royal University, Ireland, propose to examine candidates orally at the second examination in arts, and to what extent such oral examination will be carried?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): I am informed that candidates for honours will be examined orally in the subjects in which they seek honours, and that pass candidates will be examined orally in experimental physics, chemistry, biology, and geology. The extent to which this examination will be carried must be left to the discretion of the Examiners within the limits of the course defined. I have given the hon. Member the information he seeks, so far as I am able to do so; but I rather doubt the utility of putting Questions upon matters which are within the competence of the Governing Body of the University to determine.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—BANTRY UNION.

MR. DEASY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the promised inquiry into the alleged irregular alterations of the rate books of the Bantry Union has yet taken place; if not, whether he will compel the revising officer to proceed to an inquiry at once; and, whether he will take steps to have Mr. Gilhooly, P.L.G., who has made charges against certain of the Union officials and others, informed of the day on which it is intended to have the rate books examined?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): The Commissioner of Valuation informs me that it is intended to investigate this complaint next month, and that Mr. Gilhooly will receive notice prior to the holding of the inquiry.

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF COMMONS—OFFICERS OF THIS HOUSE—THE SERJEANT AND DEPUTY SERJEANT.

SIR ROBERT FOWLER (LORD MAYOR) asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether Her Majesty's Government would consider the propriety, in view of the great increase of the business of the House, of arranging that, in case of the Serjeant or Deputy Serjeant at Arms being absent from illness, the Assistant Serjeant should be available to relieve them in the Chair?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH): On consultation with the proper authorities, I find that the necessary arrangements will be made on the illness of the Serjeant-at-Arms or Deputy Serjeant to prevent any inconvenience arising.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS—REGISTRATION OF VOTERS—ALLEGED MISCONDUCT OF OVERSEERS.

MR. THOROLD ROGERS (for Mr. EARP) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether his attention has been called to the fact that a solicitor named Metcalf, residing at Southwell, Notts. who is acting as the Conservative Registration Agent for the Newark Division, has issued books to the overseers with a request to be furnished with copies of the registers marked to indicate the politics of the persons entered upon such registers, under the initials C. for Conservative, L. for Liberal, and D. for doubtful; and whether the said solicitor has received from overseers books so marked; and, what steps he proposes to take in reference to such conduct on the part of overseers paid for their services by the Government?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR): The Conservative registration agent has asked the chairman of the Conservative registration committees and others to mark copies of the registers, as stated; but Mr. Metcalf positively denies that any such application has been made to an overseer with the knowledge that he held the office of overseer, and the Report I have received from the Local Government Board Inspector, whom I requested to look into the matter, entirely confirms this denial. The hon. Member is under a misapprehension in supposing that overseers are paid for their services by the Government. The office of overseer is an unpaid and compulsory one.

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)—CONWAY UNION—MR. DAVIES, MEDICAL OFFICER.

MR. THOROLD ROGERS asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether it is the case that Mr. Thomas Davies, appointed district medical officer to the Conway Union in 1873, and confirmed by the Local Government Board, was allowed, in addition to his salary of £75 a year, the extra fees allowed by the Local Government Board and the cost of supplying expensive drugs, the district containing an area of 18,550 acres, with a rapidly increasing population; whether the Board is aware that the Conway guardians have striven to compel Mr. Davies to commute his extra fees and the cost of drugs for £10 a year; and that, on Mr. Davies refusing to accept this commutation, the Board has cancelled his contract, and withheld payment of his fees and last quarter's salary; and, whether he will inquire into the circumstances of the case, and protect Mr. Davies in case he has been wrongfully used?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR): Mr. Davies was appointed medical officer of the Conway Union, with the salary of £75 and the extra fees allowed by the Local Government Board, and the Guardians entered into a contract, under which they agreed to pay him for cod liver oil and quinine. In January, 1883, the Guardians proposed to commute the payment for the fees and medicines referred to for £10 per annum. Mr. Davies objected, and the proposal consequently was not submitted to the Board. The contract was determined two years ago; but this cancelling of the contract did not affect Mr. Davies's tenure of office. There is a dispute as to certain charges for medicines; but we are not aware of any reason why the salary of the officer should be withheld, and we have so informed the Guardians.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—THE DUBLIN SORTING OFFICE.

MR. SEXTON asked the Postmaster General, Whether he will reform the system of penalties in force against the sorting clerks in the Dublin Sorting Office, whereby a clerk one hour late (the time prescribed for attendance being 4.45 a.m.) is obliged to do three and a-half hours' punishment duty, and to pay for a messenger sent to his residence, and suffers an arrest of his annual increment of pay?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord JOHN MANNERS): In Dublin officers who are late by as much as one hour, either on Sunday mornings or on as many as four other mornings in the month, are adjudged extra duty to perform; but their annual increment of pay is not arrested unless their attendance during the 12 months prior to the date on which the increment becomes due has been habitually irregular. The attendance is by no means as regular as it ought to be even under the present system, and I certainly see no reason for altering it on the side of relaxation.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACT—ORDER IN COUNCIL—SWINE.

MR. CLARE READ asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, If he is aware of the serious loss and inconvenience which has resulted from the recent Order in Council which compels all pigs exhibited at any market or public sale to be slaughtered in three days; and, if he will amend the Order by extending the time that may elapse before slaughter to six days?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY OF LANCASTER (Mr. CHAPLIN), in reply, said, that no complaints had yet been received by the Privy Council as to serious loss and inconvenience arising from the recent Order in Council. He was quite able, however, to understand, in view of the recent hot weather, that three days might be too short a time within which to insist on compulsory slaughter, and, if the Privy Council should receive any communications or Memorials to that effect, they might be prepared to extend the time.

SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND BILL.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If he can give an assurance that the only Scotch Bill which Her Majesty's Government have expressed the intention of carrying forward, the Secretary for Scotland Bill, shall not be further postponed till the Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill, and other Bills which have come or may come from the other House of Parliament later than the Secretary for Scotland Bill, and so be endangered for want of time?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH) said, he might remind the hon. Gentleman that the second reading of the Scotch Secretary Bill had already been taken, so that it had naturally some precedence over the Land Purchase Bill, which was not in such a favourable position. The Government would do what they could to meet the convenience of Scotch Members.

H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE—CONTRACTS FOR GOVERNMENT PRINTING.

Mr. RYLANDS asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether in the proposed new contracts for Government printing it has been arranged that the contracts, if satisfactorily executed, will remain in force for ten years; and, if that is the case, whether he will state to the House the reasons which may have induced the Treasury to sanction a contract for so long a term of years?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Sir Henry Holland), in reply, said, the Government contracts for printing would be for 10 years, so as to enable smaller firms to tender. The average value of the contracts would be from £18,000 to £20,000 a-year, and if the contracts were for a shorter period none but large firms would tender for them.

LAW AND POLICE—USE OF BICYCLES ON PUBLIC ROADS—FURIOUS DRIVING.

Mr. HICKS asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been drawn to the statement in *The Observer* of last Sunday, that a charge against the owner of a bicycle for furious driving had been dismissed by Mr. Bushby, on the ground that he had no jurisdiction; and, whether he will, during the recess, prepare a Bill for the better regulation of street traffic with reference to vehicles of all descriptions?

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. Assheton Cross), in reply, said, he could not understand this decision, because undoubtedly several persons had previously been fined for furious driving of bicycles on the ordinary road. There was a recent decision that a bicycle was a carrriage, and that its rider was a driver within the meaning of the Act. As to the second part of the Question, it would require very serious consideration, and he could not answer it at present.

TRADE AND COMMERCE—THE UNITED STATES AND THE BRITISH WEST INDIES.

Sir CHARLES TENNANT asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether any Despatch has been received from the Governor of Barbadoes enclosing a Copy of a Petition to the House of Assembly, or any other Papers, showing the anxiety of the inhabitants for the speedy completion of the trade arrangements between the British West Indies and the United States; and, whether Her Majesty's Government are taking any steps to conclude the draft Convention embodying those trade arrangements?

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Colonel Stanley), in reply, said, that such a despatch had been received, enclosing a copy of the Petition and other papers. He was afraid he would not be able to give any definite answer to the hon. Gentleman upon the subject at the present time. The hon. Gentleman was aware that an influential deputation lately came to the Colonial Office, and their representations would be laid before the Government, and would receive all due consideration.

MOTIONS.

——o——

PARLIAMENT—PRIVILEGE—SPEECH OF MR. BRIGHT OF JULY 24th.

RESOLUTION.

Mr. CALLAN: I rise, Sir, to ask the permission of the House to call attention to a speech recently delivered by the right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright). That speech is correctly reported, I presume, in *The Daily News* of Saturday, the 25th of July, because I find that in *The Daily Chronicle* and *The Daily Telegraph* the words of which I complain are *ipsissima verba* the same. The report which appears in *The Times* differs somewhat; but that paper has apparently condensed the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman. I should not have thought it necessary, under any other circumstances, to introduce a matter of this kind, but for the grave nature of the charges made against a number of hon. Members of this House, who, although not named personally, are charged by the right hon. Gentleman with "disloyalty to the Crown and boundless sympathy for criminals and murderers." I am aware that in this House, in 1882, the right hon. Gentleman the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt) took upon himself to charge an hon. Member, in his absence—for there is always prudence in the right hon. Gentleman's speeches—with sympathies of a similar character. But the speech of which I complain was delivered by the right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright) at a banquet to do honour to Earl Spencer, the late Viceroy of Ireland, not in an obscure corner, but on an occasion which will be memorable—I might almost say historic—in connection with the great Whig Party. The right hon. Gentleman, towards the close of the proceedings, indulged in one of his usual tirades against those whom he supposed had done him and his Party some wrong. I will read, Sir, the observations of which I complain. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "Whatever is due, Lord Spencer has had his share in the responsibility, and he must have his share in the credit and glory. (Cheers.) Well, now, in this meeting perhaps I may be permitted to ask who are his assailants? (Hear, hear.) They are to be found in some conductors of the Irish Press, and in some of those who profess to be Representatives of Ireland, and who sit in that character in the House of Commons. Now, these men—I speak of those who have brought these hideous charges against Lord Spencer—I say that they are disloyal to the Crown, and that they are hostile, directly hostile, to Great Britain. (Cheers.)"

Now, I say that I have taken the Oath of Allegiance; and I have attacked Lord Spencer. Therefore, I am stigmatized by the right hon. Gentleman as a perjurer, because I have taken the Oath of Allegiance that—

> "I, A. B., do swear that I will be faithful, and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, her heirs and successors, according to law. So help me God."

And I do not regard the words of the Oath, as some hon. Members regard them, as words of an idle and meaningless character. As a member of the Roman Catholic Church, I regard the taking of the Oath as a most solemn act, and I will take the description of how I regard the words of the Oath from the late Member for North Devon (Sir Stafford Northcote)—"I regard the Oath as a most solemn invocation of the Supreme Power." Nevertheless, as an assailant of Earl Spencer and some of his acts, I am accused in so many words of being disloyal to the Crown, and a perjurer—a charge I repudiate with scorn and contempt. The right hon. Gentleman in his speech proceeded to say—

> "They have, so far as they could do it, obstructed all legislation which was intended to discover or to prevent or to punish crime. Throughout these years, ever since the late Government was formed, or nearly so, there has been nothing done in the direction of discovering crime or of convicting and punishing criminals which has not been directly and persistently obstructed by these men, who profess to be the friends of Ireland, and who have been the main and virulent assailants of Lord Spencer."

—["Hear, hear!" *from the Front Opposition Bench.*]—I am glad to hear that cheer. I am glad to hear the endorsement of that foul and, I will say, that false charge. I am glad to hear that cheer coming from the Whigs and Radicals above the Gangway, and I hope the Irish people, both in England and Ireland, will bear that cheer in memory. The right hon. Gentleman further said—

> "They have insulted and denounced every man in Ireland concerned in the just administration of the law. They have attacked the Viceroy in a manner that hitherto, I think, has been utterly unknown with regard to the great Officers of the Crown in this Kingdom."

I will say that no great Officer of the Crown in this Kingdom, within my memory, has so rightly deserved these attacks as Earl Spencer. When we made these attacks, we made them in the face of the House of Commons, and not at a select meeting of our own partizans—

> "They have attacked the men against whom no charge whatsoever of any kind could by any possibility be authenticated."

We charged Bolton, we charged Cornwall, and we charged French—aye, and we proved our charges. Yet the right hon. Gentleman says that we "attacked men against whom no charge whatsoever of any kind could by any possibility be authenticated."

MR. JOHN BRIGHT: When I used the word "men," I used the word "Judges" before it. I said—"Judges, men against whom no charge could by any possibility be authenticated." The word "Judges" is left out of the report, so that what the hon. Gentleman is saying now has nothing to do with the matter.

MR. CALLAN: They are not the words upon which I intend to found a Motion; but I accept any explanation the right hon. Gentleman may offer. I hope he will be able to give a full explanation when he has the opportunity. In his speech the right hon. Gentleman went on to say—

> "They have attacked the Law Officers of the Crown, and they have attacked indiscriminately every jury by which any guilty man has been convicted. (Cheers.) Now, what they have exhibited, on the contrary, is this—a boundless sympathy for criminals and murderers. (Loud cheers.)"

These charges against Members of the House of Commons constitute a distinct breach of Privilege, and in support of that proposition I will quote two precedents. The first is reported in *Hansard*, Third Series, Vol. 41, 1838, February 26th, page 104. The expressions complained of were from the report in *The Morning Post* of February 22nd, 1838, and were read by the Clerk at the Table—

> "He (Mr. O'Connell) did not mince the matter. His words might appear in the public Press—he hoped they would. Ireland was not safe from the perjury of the English and Scotch gentry, who took oaths according to justice and voted according to Party."

For that speech, Mr. O'Connell was brought before this House, and, having appeared in his place, he justified the words he had used. I am not going to justify the words, because they were voted to be a breach of the Privileges of this House, and Mr. O'Connell was censured. The next case upon which I rely for bringing the speech of the right hon. Gentleman within the Rules of the House in regard to breach of Privilege, is one which happened in the year 1873. On Monday, the 31st of March in that year, an article appeared in *The Pall Mall Gazette*, which was brought under the notice of the House on the following Thursday, April 3, by Mr. Munster, the then Member for Mallow. That article charged—

> "That the Irish Ultramontane Members had resorted to any quibble discoverable in the technicalities of the law of Parliament to defeat or delay a measure like Mr. Fawcett's, which cuts the ground from under their venial agitations, and their traffic in noisy disloyalty."

On that occasion, one Irish Member, who I perceive was at the dinner to Lord Spencer at which the charges of the right hon. Member for Birmingham were made, asked what was meant by the term "disloyalty." It was the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry).

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: The hon. Member for the County of Galway.

MR. CALLAN: I accept the correction of my hon. Friend. I am sure he does not wish to be mentioned as having been present at the banquet. The hon. Member for Galway County asked—

> "What can be meant by the term 'disloyalty,' except to charge them with conduct that would make them unworthy to be Members of this House."—(3 *Hansard*, [215] 533.)

The right hon. Gentleman has charged us with being disloyal to the Crown, and in language far more specific than that which was employed in the article in *The Pall Mall Gazette.* In the course of the debate upon *The Pall Mall Gazette*—and I think the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham will do well to study that debate—the late Attorney General (Sir Henry James) said—

> "Everybody must sympathize very strongly with the feelings of any hon. Member of this House who deems his character to have been aspersed and his loyalty called in question."—(*Ibid.* 535.)

That was when we were supporting the Liberal Party, when the Irish Ultramontane Members were found day after day and night after night in the Lobby with the Whigs and Liberals. The right hon. and learned Gentleman then said that everyone must sympathize strongly with the feelings of the Irish Members when they deemed that their character was aspersed or their loyalty called in question. I do not know whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman is in the House at the present moment; but I hope that when I come to make my Motion, he will extend his sympathies towards the Irish Members who deem their conduct to have been aspersed and their loyalty called in question, by appearing in the same Lobby with them. The right hon. and learned Gentleman further said—

> "No excuse or apology is needed on the part of the hon. Gentlemen who have brought this matter forward on account of the article to

which they have called attention. Everybody must sympathize with them if the article were really intended to asperse the motives and characters of hon. Members."—(*Ibid.*)

Will the Liberal ex-Attorney General express similar sentiments now? I am glad to afford to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham an opportunity for declaring that, in the language he used, he had no intention to asperse our motives or character. The right hon. and learned Gentleman said—and I suppose he is a great authority in this House on all questions concerning Parliamentary regulations and law—

> "I agree with the hon. Gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. McCarthy Downing) that it is a serious matter if the honour and character of Members of this House are publicly aspersed. Certainly it is a matter which cannot be got rid of by a joke."—(*Ibid.* 536.)

Referring to Sir Erskine May's *Law and Practice of Parliament*, I find it there laid down that—

> "In order to constitute a breach of Privilege a libel complained of must concern the character or conduct of Members in that capacity."

The right hon. Gentleman, after asking who Lord Spencer's assailants were, said—

> "They are to be found in some of those who profess to be Representatives of Ireland, and who sit in that character in the House of Commons."

That substantially brings them within the rule laid down by the late Attorney General—namely, that their character must have been aspersed and their loyalty called in question as Members of the House of Commons. That law I hold to be still good. The next instance which I wish to bring forward is one which was brought forward in this House by my Predecessor in the representation of the county of Louth—the late Mr. A. M. Sullivan—of whom, however much we may have differed on some occasions, I am glad to have this opportunity of saying that no man more esteemed his high personal and political character than I did and have continued to do. On that occasion, which is reported in *Hansard*, Third Series, Vol. 222, pages 330, 331, and 332, Monday, February 15, 1875, Mr. Sullivan brought forward a speech which had been made by the hon. and learned Member for Frome, now Mr. Justice Lopes; and I wish the House to compare the language of Mr. Lopes with that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham. The language complained of was this—Mr. Lopes had asked—

> "What was the present position of the Liberal Party? In the House of Commons they were deserted by their Chief, who, by his fitful appearance in the House, disappointed their hopes. They were allied to a disreputable Irish band, whose watchword in the House was Home Rule and Repeal of the Union."—(3 *Hansard*, [222] 319.)

We find the same words banded about again. The Liberal Party, when they find that we do not follow them as before, say that we have entered into an unholy alliance. We decline to follow them in their coercive policy towards Ireland, not because we love the Tories, but because we dislike the cant and hypocrisy of Liberal and Radical Members and the coercion of the Whigs more than we do the generous fair play of the Conservative Party. What did Mr. Disraeli say on that occasion? He said—

> "I am not here to deny that it is a breach of Privilege to speak of any Members of this House in their capacity as such in terms which imply disgrace, or, as the hon. Gentleman said, 'ignominy.' . . . No doubt the Irish Members in their turn—at least a section of them—are sometimes spoken of in a manner which I do not at all justify—which would not be permitted in this House, or which, if any hon. Member had inadvertently so spoken here, would give rise to the opportunity now offered to my hon. and learned Friend of showing his regret for such language."—(*Ibid.* 330-31.)

There was an excuse made on that occasion, that it was an after-dinner speech; but that excuse does not hold good in regard to the speech of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bright), because I find that the right hon. Gentleman, in drinking the health of Lord Spencer, said—

> "I am now about to perform a duty in a beverage which is much more ancient than wine, and much more wholesome. But I am tolerant in matters of this kind."

We all know that the right hon. Gentleman is prominently characterized by the tolerance of his opinions of those who do not agree with him. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "I am tolerant in matters of this kind as in most others; and, therefore, I do not ask everyone to follow my example."

I am quite certain that if we had continued to follow the right hon. Gentleman, as we did for so many years, this language would never have been used towards us. Mr. Disraeli, on the occasion to which I have referred, went on to say—

> "The hon. Member who spoke second in the debate (Mr. O'Connor Power) asks what we, on the Front Ministerial Bench, would have done if this expression had been used respecting us. Well, Sir, ... I think I may say what all my Colleagues would have done would have been to take no notice of it. At the same time, I do not say that the course we should have pursued ought to prevent Irish Members from receiving the satisfaction to which they are entitled from my hon. and learned Friend, who has now an opportunity, in a full House, of doing that which is, I think, the privilege, as well as the duty of an English gentleman when he has done wrong . . . . I mean frankly to express his regret. . . . . I hope my hon. and learned Friend will now make use of this opportunity, ... and that we shall be able to extricate the House from the painful necessity of making this a question of Privilege."—(*Ibid.*, 332.)

Mr. Lopes explained, expressed regret, and withdrew the language complained of. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would follow the advice given by Mr. Disraeli to the hon. and learned Member for Frome (Mr. Lopes). The language which Mr. Disraeli addressed to Mr. Lopes I now address to the right hon. Gentleman. I hope he will now exercise the privilege as well as the duty of an English gentleman when he has done wrong—a course which will enable his friends to respect him the more—that he will frankly express his regret, and relieve the House from the painful necessity of making this a question of Privilege. I am afraid, however, that my appeal may not prove successful, especially when I remember that this is not the first time the right hon. Gentleman has made an appearance in a case of breach of Privilege. A little more than two years ago, he appeared in this House to answer a charge of breach of Privilege brought forward by Sir Stafford Northcote. On that occasion he had charged the Conservative Party with being in alliance with the Irish rebel Party; and upon that occasion he was extricated out of his difficulty by the right hon. Gentleman then at the head of the Government. I commend to the notice of the right hon. Gentleman the language then used by Mr. Gibson, whose absence from this House we all regret, although we, as Irish Members, are proud of his elevation to the Upper House. Mr. Gibson said that such a charge should be met by apology, by withdrawal, by explanation, or by frank and manly insistance. I invite the right hon. Gentleman therefore to withdraw, to apologize, or to stand by his words. I will not venture to trespass further upon the House, fearful that I may inadvertently drop some word which may give, or may appear to give, offence. I come here as an Irish Member hating and abhorring crime. I can tell the Front Opposition Bench especially that I have no sympathy with criminals, whether against the moral law or the law of the land. I have had my feelings outraged when I found cases of great criminality overlooked by the Home Secretary within the last few months. I abhor and detest crime. Every murder which takes place in Ireland makes me so unhappy that my greatest wish is to detect it. I have such an abhorrence of murder that for days I have not come to the House ashamed on account of some fearful murder which had been committed in Ireland; and yet, because I am an assailant of Lord Spencer now, I have been spoken of in the language used by the right hon. Gentleman. For years I entertained a high respect for that Nobleman. Of his first Administration in Ireland I have preserved a kindly memory; and neither in this House nor out of it have I said a word against Lord Spencer, until I may almost say the murder of Myles Joyce. From that moment I became acquainted with the Lord Lieutenant's action at the time of that man's execution I have assailed Lord Spencer in the House on every occasion on which I have thought proper, and I will continue to do so. And yet, because I am an assailant of Lord Spencer, I am to be stigmatized as disloyal to the Crown, and as having a boundless sympathy for criminals and murderers. I would ask the Clerk at the Table to read the words complained of, and then I will afterwards move the Resolution of which I have given Notice.

The said Paper was then delivered in, and the paragraph complained of read by the Clerk at the Table.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

> "That the expressions in the Speech of the Right honourable John Bright, delivered in the Westminster Palace Hotel on Friday night, the 24th of July, as reported in *The Daily News* of Saturday, the 25th of July, charging that cer-

ain Members 'who profess to be representatives of Ireland, and who sit in that character in the House of Commons, are disloyal to the Crown,' and that 'they have exhibited a boundless sympathy for criminals and murderers,' are a Breach of the Privileges of the House."—(*Mr. Callan.*)

Mr. JOHN BRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, in offering a few observations to the House, I will begin by giving a little information to the hon. Member who has brought forward this Motion. There are Members from Ireland to whom my words apply; but as far as I know he is not one of them. I do not recollect, except on this occasion, and during his speech to-night, when he has made grave and, I think, almost horrible charges against Lord Spencer—I do not recollect, except on this occasion, hearing him say either in this House or that I ever read anything that he has said out of it, that would have justified me in including him in the number of those to whom reference was made in my speech the other night. I only say that for the sake of explaining to the hon. Gentleman that, at any rate, I have not done him, nor have I intended to do him any injustice; and if he has suffered from it I will now relieve his mind by telling him that not for one moment has he ever been in my mind as guilty of the charges that I have brought against some of his countrymen. The hon. Member I presume comes forward to-night in the character of a protector of his countrymen, and I have no objection at all to the question he has raised as to what I said some nights ago, or to the further consideration of it by the House and the country, which it will have, no doubt, from the discussion which is now proceeding. Let us see what was the object of the banquet in which this terrible speech was made. The object was to bring together a large number—I suppose there were nearly 200—of persons there, Members of the two Houses of Parliament, for the purpose of showing the general esteem in which the character of the late Viceroy of Ireland is held, and for the purpose, as it might occur, of meeting some of the charges which had been made against him. The hon. Member, and in fact the House, will know that Lord Spencer in his speech on that occasion did refer to a great many of the serious charges made against him, and gave such answers to them as he was able to give, answers which were certainly satisfactory to the 200 Members who were assembled there. It is a natural thing, in discussing these charges, to ask who it is that makes them, and what are the charges that are made; because the same complaint, coming from one source, might be very serious, while, coming from another, it might be very trifling. It seemed to me a proper opportunity of entering a little into this question, and I went into it, perhaps, a little deeper, although in much fewer words than those which were used by others who spoke on that occasion. Now, as to the charges that were made against Lord Spencer, what I have heard just now from the hon. Gentleman shocks me; and if I had heard him before that speech I think I should have been obliged to include the hon. Member in what I said. There is no meanness of which any man can be guilty—none which can be attributed to a Governor or Ruler in any position—that has not been constantly imputed to Lord Spencer; and more than that in the Irish Press, and I would not say not even by some Irish Members. It has been stated distinctly, over and over again, that Lord Spencer sent to the gallows men whom he knew to be innocent. If that charge is made, it is impossible to put into words a more grievous charge. The most guilty murderer who has gone to the gallows was not himself, if that be true, more guilty than Lord Spencer. Well, then, these are charges which the hon. Member himself in this House, and no doubt a considerable number in Ireland, and writers in the Irish Press, have brought against the Viceroy, the Representative of the Queen. If that be so, would it be a hard thing to say that such persons as these are disloyal? If Lord Spencer has represented the Queen in the City of Dublin, and as the Viceroy of Ireland, surely, if he has not been guilty of crimes as atrocious as those which have been imputed to him, no man would make such charges unless he was disloyal to the Viceroy and disloyal to the Queen. Now, as to the question of disloyalty, the hon. Member gives me the opportunity of referring to the case which was brought forward two years ago from this Bench by Sir Stafford Northcote. Sir Stafford Northcote evidently did something that he had no heart in at all. The proposition was merely this—and the whole proposition was quite absurd—Sir Stafford Northcote's only charge was that I said that when the Tory Party went into the Lobby they found themselves in alliance—that is, acting and voting together for the time—with the Irish Party. I did not say they had any special contract—nothing of the sort; but as both went into the same Lobby, they were, for the time being, in alliance. When I came to answer Sir Stafford Northcote, I had the idea that he was going to complain of something more—that his Friends down here (the Irish Members) were termed by me "the rebel Party" in the speech I made at Birmingham, and which was called in question. But when I mentioned that in the House and spoke of them as the rebel Party, did any of them repudiate it? Do they repudiate it now? [*Cries of* "No!"] On the contrary, they accepted it, and cheered it.

MR. MARUM: I repudiate it, on behalf of my Party.

MR. JOHN BRIGHT: I have not the least doubt that many men of the Party would repudiate it. I will take my hon. Friend, whom I have known for many years, the Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy). I do not believe he is a rebel. But if hon. Members down there are to be taken by their own words, by their own writings, and by their own actions, there are some of them who have a fair claim to the title of rebel. [An Irish MEMBER: We rebel against the English rule, certainly.] The hon. Gentlemen to whom I refer constantly describe this House as a foreign House; and when we sat on the other side—I do not know what would be the term now—they said that we were a foreign Administration. I only bring that forward to strengthen the argument I have used, and to justify my words. But there has been a little incident which happened just now. If report be correct, a very important member of the Irish Party—I mean Mr. Davitt—has been asked to come to this House by one of the constituencies ready to return him. Mr. Davitt, except when a landlord is in question, appears to me to be a particularly honest man. I think that most persons who know him, however much they may disagree with him, still have a certain respect for him that they have not for some others. Well, but Mr. Davitt says that he will not come into this House, because he will not take the Oath of Allegiance to the Queen; and there are others—I will not name them, but I have heard of more than one—highly respectable and honest men in Ireland, who would be admirable Members of this House; but they cannot, in conscience, take the Oath of Allegiance, because they are not loyal to the Throne. That is one of the charges which I have brought against some hon. Gentlemen; and I think, from the way in which they have received my observations, it is quite clear that it is a charge they do not repudiate. I have said, further—I think it was one of the points to which the hon. Member referred—that these Gentlemen had done what they could to obstruct legislation in 1881 and 1882. Now, I am not about to defend the legislation of 1881 and 1882. I think that the legislation of 1881 was, unfortunately, a great mistake, though I was myself a Member of the Government that was concerned in it. But, as regards the obstruction, it must be borne in mind that a very large majority of the House of Commons supported those measures; and whether they were wise or foolish measures, at any rate they were believed by the House of Commons to be absolutely necessary, and, therefore, to be wise. Everybody who was in this House at that time knows perfectly well how much hon. Members obstructed. They may reconcile it with their duty, and I entirely separate this charge from other charges. I may remark that I am not going to complain of their obstruction. It is quite possible for me to conceive of circumstances in this House in which I myself might be tempted—though I do not think I should have persisted in it so long as they did—to do something in order to prevent a Bill from passing which I thought would be injurious to the country. But that they did obstruct nobody in the House of Commons can doubt. And I believe that the only time in which they allowed a particular clause to pass, which the Government did not want, was when they went out of the House and took up a position in the Gallery in order that the Government might be placed in a minority, and that a clause might be put into the Act which the Government did not want to have put into it, but which those hon. Gentlemen thought would make the Bill more hateful to their own country. Well, I said that Lord Spencer had been assailed—the hon. Member (Mr. Callan) has done a little in that line to-night—and that they had also assailed the Judges. In the speech, as read, the word "Judges" is left out. It comes before the word "men." I said they assailed the Judges; they assailed the Law Officers; and they assailed the juries. They have said over and over again—I do not point to any particular Member here now, but I believe some hon. Members have said it in Ireland; the hon Gentleman has almost said it here to-night; but it has been frequently said in Ireland, and it has been stated in the Irish Press—that Lord Spencer hanged innocent men, knowing them to be innocent. Then, again, they have assailed the Judges, and declared them to be partial and partizans. They have assailed the Law Officers of the Crown, and charged them with packing the juries. And then, finally, they assailed the juries, because, being packed juries, they would easily be rendered corrupt. That is what they have done; but it has all been done on one line—namely, that of sympathy for criminals who were in prison, or men under trial; and I have never heard any emphatic declaration in this House, or out of it, nor have I read, with scarcely any exception, declarations against the criminals, except at the time when the Phœnix Park tragedy took place, and when men even on those—the Irish—Benches were astounded and were cowed by the feeling that then prevailed throughout the whole country. And then they did express what I cannot but believe they really felt—that a great crime had been committed, and that great sorrow had been spread throughout all our people, and throughout Ireland, I hope, not less than throughout England. Suppose, instead of saying what has been read at the Table—suppose I had said that the Irish Party, every man of them in the House of Commons, was loyal. Suppose I had said that they were particularly friendly to Great Britain—suppose I had said that they all encouraged and supported the discovery and the punishment of crime—suppose I had said that they trusted and supported, so far as they could, the Viceroy in his difficult task of governing the country—suppose I had said that they supported the Judges and the Law Officers, and that they had really condemned, in strong and emphatic language continually, all those who committed these great crimes, and offered the spectacle to the country of such criminals—suppose I had said that they had exhibited great grief at the violent and murderous crimes which had been committed in Ireland—suppose I had said exactly the opposite of what I did say, and if that had been read from the Table, what would the House of Commons have said, or the Gentlemen who were present at that dinner table, or the public, or the Irish Members themselves? They would have said that I was a fool, or something worse, for making statements which were absolutely untrue, and they would have laughed me to scorn, and said that I had spoken for the sake of insulting them. Therefore, what I have to say of the speech is this—I will not say that every syllable is accurate, for there are words left out, and where the word "every" comes in with regard to juries it is not accurate; it should be "many" juries, and the word "Judges" requires to be put in. But, with that exception, I say that every word of the speech is accurate and true. I say, as I said to 200 of the first gentlemen of England, that every Member of the House of Lords and the House of Commons might accept it as such; and scores of them have told me how entirely they accepted and agreed with every word I uttered. Then comes one other question, and I will have done in a sentence. Supposing all this is true, was it a desirable thing to make that statement on that occasion, and to bring those charges against any Member of this House? Well, I will not contest the point at all. It is for you, Sir, to say whether such a course is a breach of the Privileges of Parliament. I think that it is likely a Rule of that sort may be used on very insufficient basis and ground; but if I said anything on that occasion which is contrary to the Rules of Parliament and the decisions of yourself, Sir, or of previous Speakers, all I can say is that I regret it very much, because no man has a right, in a great Assembly like this, to set up his own opinion against the opinion of the Assembly, and against the opinion of its presiding

Officer; and if the House of Commons thinks that observations like mine, and all others of an unpleasant kind against Members of the House, made out of the House, are a breach of the Rules and Privileges of Parliament, I myself shall regret that I have committed myself so far. But, so far as the truth of what I have said is concerned, nothing in the world will induce me to withdraw an atom of it. I was a friend of Ireland in the politics of this country when some of the men whom I have seen on those Benches were in their long clothes. For more than 30 years past I have done all I could to lay before the public, both in Ireland and in England, to lay before Parliament and the country what I believe to be the grievances which that country endures. I have suffered strong attacks from newspapers and from public speakers in both Houses of Parliament on account of the line I have taken in regard to Ireland. I believe the sufferings and the ill-treatment of that country within the last 150 years can scarcely be exaggerated, and my sympathy for it has been as strong as the sympathy of any man on those Benches. And, Sir, if I had seen a combination in Ireland—such as I once advised a meeting of Irish farmers to form—a combination that would deal fairly and justly with all questions affecting that country, which would not be rebellious to this country, which was not concerned in criminal actions, which was not in alliance with the enemies of England beyond the Atlantic, which did not receive money from them, which did not receive, as friends, the criminals they sent over to this country—if I had seen an Irish association which dealt with some regard to moral laws while urging the great justice of the claims of their country, I should have been one of that association, and no word would ever have escaped my lips to lessen the influence of those men in the country which they represent. Sir, I have done; I have only to repeat that if you decide, or if previous Speakers have decided—for I presume you will be guided very much by precedent—that to make charges, such as I have made, against Members of this House, is not to be allowed, and is contrary to the Rules and practice of the House, I submit and express my regret that I said what I did on that occasion. That being so, I must leave it to the House; but, as to regretting what I have said, nothing can change my opinion, if I know it.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY rose to continue the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: As the language attributed to the right hon. Gentleman is now under the consideration of the House the right hon. Gentleman will follow precedent by withdrawing.

MR. JOHN BRIGHT: Cannot I stay here, Sir, if I do not vote?

MR. SPEAKER: The course generally followed is to withdraw; and the right hon. Gentleman will follow precedent by withdrawing.

MR. JOHN BRIGHT then withdrew.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY: I confess that I, for one, very much regret that the Rules of the House compel the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham to withdraw while the debate is going on, as for many reasons, some of them personal, I should prefer that the right hon. Gentleman were present to listen to the few observations I shall have to make. My hon. Friend the Member for Louth (Mr. Callan) told me of his intention to bring forward this Motion only after he had already taken steps to put that intention into action. Had I been consulted, and had he asked my advice as to bringing forward the Motion, I would have had no hesitation in recommending the hon. Member to take no notice whatever of the charges made by the right hon. Gentleman. Personally, I am not fond of appealing to the judgment of the House, which I know, in the main, to be hostile, for the vindication of my honour and character, or the honour and character of those Irish Members who act with me. I would much rather leave the decision of the question to a future and a wiser time, when passion and prejudice will not rage quite so strongly as at the present moment. I would say something more. There was a time when a word of censure or a question of my motives from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham would have affected me deeply, and caused me the severest pain. That was in the days so honourable to the right hon. Gentleman, when he showed himself the friend of Ireland, when he was not nearly so severe upon Parties who were opposed to him, and whom he now calls rebels—days when the right hon. Gentleman did not stigmatize and denounce as rebellious every opposition made to an English Viceroy—days when he himself told me, I then holding the opinions I now hold, that I was not nearly National enough, and that if he were in my position he would fight much more strongly, and go much further then I did. But times have changed with the right hon. Gentleman; perhaps an unconscious change has come over him; but from the moment that his own Party came into Office he left the path he had followed with regard to Ireland, and he renounced the principles he had previously held. From the very moment that his Party came into Office, from the moment that any objection was raised to the coercive measures of his Colleagues, he, who had denounced coercion in other days with an eloquence no other man can pretend to, became impatient of any opposition to coercion, and by rapid degrees became the enemy of Ireland, and of the Party which he knows alone represents the Irish people. We know that of late years the right hon. Gentleman has got into the habit of expressing himself rather strongly against those who do not agree with him in opinion; and, therefore, when the right hon. Gentleman applies to anyone the words "rebel," "knave," and "traitor," we feel that that is only the right hon. Gentleman's way of announcing that he does not agree with something someone may have said or done. As the right hon. Gentleman has done me the favour to allude to me as a friend, and to say that he does not believe I am a rebel, although a Member of a rebel Party, I would say that the friendship of the right hon. Gentleman was one which I was once most proud of; but of late years that feeling has drifted away from my memory, and his appeal does not awaken quite so strong an echo as it might once have done. What does the charge of rebel imply? I am not a rebel, because I believe that rebellion is unnecessary and impossible of success. I am not a rebel, because I believe we can accomplish very great changes in Ireland by following out in the English House of Commons the course we have pursued for the last five or six years. I am, therefore, not a rebel, nor a Member of a rebel Party; but if the right hon. Gentleman, who regards a charge against the Viceroy as identical with a charge of disloyalty against the Sovereign—if the right hon. Gentleman were to ask me in the face of this House what my sentiments are in regard to the rights which we claim from this House, I would tell him that rebellion has been justified over and over again when it has been necessary, but only as a last resort; and I hold that I should be amply justified in being a Member of a rebel Party if it were not possible, by peaceful agitation, to overthrow a system which I know to be bad and vicious. Having made that declaration I will say no more.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH): I would venture to express a hope that this matter need not occupy much time. I regretted very much, when I saw the report of the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright), that he had not imitated the excellent example set by the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Hartington), and by Lord Spencer himself, in the moderation of the observations which they made on the subject of Ireland on that occasion. The noble Marquess opposite entered into some topics with regard to which I cannot admit the justice of his criticism. I allude to his references to the action and the policy of the present Government. But not one word which fell from him, or from Lord Spencer, could have been objected to as improper to be used in debate in this House. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham, however, felt himself impelled on that occasion to use the language which has been quoted by the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Callan), and of which I can only say that if the right hon Gentleman had used it in his place in the House of Commons he would have been called to Order by you, Sir, and directed to withdraw it. If I am right in that opinion, I think it follows, from what was said this evening by the right hon. Gentleman himself, that he would be disposed to admit, at any rate, that his remarks were out of place. But, Sir, the question, to my mind, is not whether the language which has been used does or does not constitute a breach of the Privileges of the House of Commons, but whether the House of Commons is well advised on this, or on similar occasions, in taking notice of such language as a breach of Privilege. Allusion has been made to a debate raised by the late Mr. A. M. Sullivan, then Member for Louth, with reference to some observations made by the present Mr. Justice Lopes, who had characterized certain Irish Members who at that time followed the Leadership of the late Mr. Butt as a disreputable band. Lord Beaconsfield, on that occasion, made some remarks which are well worthy the attention of the House of Commons. He called attention to the fact, which I am afraid grows on us every year, that there is at these after-dinner meetings, and on many occasions of political discussion out-of-doors, a kind of conventional language used by persons in regard to others of opposite political opinions, which is certainly not Parliamentary language, and which sometimes, as he observed, is not even the English language itself. Lord Beaconsfield went on to say, in reply to questions addressed to him by some Irish Member—I think by the hon. Member for Louth himself—that if he and his Colleagues on the Treasury Bench had been called a disreputable band he should have taken no notice of the observation at all. Well, the hon. Members for Louth (Mr. Callan) and Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) have for themselves entirely repudiated the applicability of the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham. They have repudiated those remarks with indignation. Does it not follow from the very fact of that repudiation that they may afford, at any rate, to leave the remarks unnoticed, as we should leave them had they been addressed to us? The House should remember that we are on the eve of a very hot electoral campaign. We have already had some foretaste of what may be said of the Government in that campaign from the right hon. Gentleman the junior Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), who accused us the other day of political immorality, if not of something worse. Well, we do not intend, whatever may be said by that right hon. Gentleman—and we know that the weaker his case the more violent is his language likely to be—we do not intend to ask the protection of the House by declaring any language that may be used against us to be a breach of Privilege. I think that the hon. Members for Louth and Longford, and those who agree with them in the opinions they have expressed, might with propriety follow that example; for I am sure it would not be desirable for this House to set up the precedent of treating as a breach of Privilege remarks or writings out-of-doors directed, not against individual Members, but against the Members of a political Party. Were we to adopt that course, we should not know where to stop, and the adoption of it would lead to debates in this House which would embitter our political differences, materially interfere with the progress of that Business which we are anxious to forward, and in the end would not be satisfactory or creditable either to the House or to the country. Therefore, Sir, for these reasons, without reference to the language which may have been used, and quite irrespective of anything which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) has said to-night in his justification, I feel myself unable to support the Resolution which has been proposed.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I need scarcely say that I entirely agree with, and intend to support, the conclusion at which the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer has arrived. I understand that the right hon. Gentleman intends, if this Motion is pressed, to give his vote against it, and to recommend those who follow his Leadership to do the same. In that advice, as I have said, I entirely concur. My right hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright), in the speech which he has just delivered, has done, in my opinion, all that which the House can expect from any one of its Members. While maintaining the accuracy and truth of the statements which he has made, he has submitted himself to the judgment of the House as to the appropriateness and legality of the use of such terms as he employed at the banquet given to Lord Spencer respecting any of its Members. He has submitted himself to the judgment of the Speaker of the House and of the House itself. Now, Sir, I presume that if you had considered that the language which was used by my right hon. Friend constituted in itself a breach of the Privileges of this House, you would have considered it your duty to give some intimation of that fact; but, as you have not done so, I conclude that you consider it is a case in which it is not necessary to give a ruling of the kind which I have described, and that the question is one for the House itself to decide. I think the House will be of opinion that language of this character—language such as has been used by my right hon. Friend—is not language with which it is desirable to deal as language involving a question of Privilege. But, although I entirely concur in the conclusion at which the right hon. Gentleman opposite has arrived, I must say that I feel some disappointment at the tone of some of the remarks with which he prefaced that conclusion. The right hon. Gentleman said that he greatly regretted the language which has been used by my right hon. Friend. But, Sir, the right hon. Gentleman paid no attention, and made no reference whatever, to the explanation given by right hon. Friend, nor had he a word to say as to the conduct or the language which has been used on previous occasions by those on whose conduct my right hon. Friend was remarking. The language used by my right hon. Friend, although it was strong language, although it applied to a greater or less number of the Members of this House, was, in my opinion, in its application careful and guarded language. My right hon. Friend did not apply the language complained of to any Party or body of men in this House; he carefully guarded himself against any such application of it to any Party in this House. What my right hon. Friend was careful to say was this —"I speak of those who have brought these hideous charges against Lord Spencer;" and everything which my right hon. Friend said which is complained of applied, not to the Irish Party—not to the Party which follows the lead of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), but to the men who have brought these hideous charges against Lord Spencer. Is the right hon. Gentleman opposite, who has so calmly expressed his regret for the language of my right hon. Friend, prepared to say that that language was too strong, or too inappropriate, or inapplicable to those men who had, in this House and out of it, persistently brought these hideous charges against my noble Friend? Does the right hon. Gentleman think that it is tolerable, that it is consistent with good government, with the maintenance of peace and order in Ireland, that no notice whatever should be taken of men who habitually, in season and out of season, bring hideous charges against the head of the Irish Government, and that it is unseemly and improper that energetic and strong language should be used in describing the conduct of those persons?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH): I really must protest against the suggestion of the noble Marquess. I think that both he and Lord Spencer himself, on that very occasion, alluded in fitting terms to charges of the nature which he describes; and, as for myself, I have said plainly that they have disfigured our debates in this House. I protest against such charges as strongly as anyone can; but the fact that such charges have been made against Lord Spencer —charges which never ought to have been made—surely does not justify such language as has been used, if that language could not have been used in debate in this House. That was my point.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I entirely differ from the right hon. Gentleman. There has been a vast amount of language used about Lord Spencer and about the Irish Government out-of-doors and in the Press which could not have been used in this House. It has, however, been used, and it has not been considered necessary or desirable that notice should be taken of it here. But I say that the fact that such language has been used—that it has notoriously been used—does, in my opinion, not only excuse, but justify the language of my right hon. Friend respecting those who have made these charges; and I differ from the right hon. Gentleman opposite in thinking that it is to be regretted, or that it is a matter of reproach to my right hon. Friend in any way whatever, that he should have deliberately used the language which he did use respecting men who have made the charges. Well, Sir, as I have said, I quite agree with the right hon. Gentleman that if the House should decide to deal with this question as a question of Privilege, it would be departing from all its precedents—at all events, from all the precedents that I recollect. It has not been very infrequent, during recent years, that language used out-of-doors has been made the subject of discussion in this House; but, so far as I recollect, the House has never decided to take any action with regard to it, and in that I think it has done wisely. The most recent case I can recollect, or of which I have any knowledge, in which the House has acted otherwise, was the case of Mr. Pelham, who brought certain charges against certain Members of this House; and the House, after hearing Mr. Pelham, resolved that the imputations made against two of its Members were wholly unfounded and calumnious, and did not affect the honour and character of the Members concerned. Well, Sir, it seems to me that, if criticism on the conduct of Members outside the House is to be made the subject of discussion at all, a Motion such as that should be founded upon it; and I must confess that my own opinion—which I trust will be the opinion of the great majority of the House also—is that upon the statements we have heard made to-night, or upon any statements that could be made, it would be absolutely impossible for this House to come to any such conclusion as that the language used by my right hon. Friend, strong though it was, was in any degree unfounded or calumnious. I have already said that the language of my right hon. Friend was carefully guarded, and was not applied indiscriminately to any body of men in this House. Now, Sir, I want to know what part of the language of my right hon. Friend is impugned, and, still more, what part of it is denied? Is it denied that hideous charges have been made against Lord Spencer and the Executive Government of Ireland? [An Irish MEMBER: They are true.] An hon. Member says that they are true. Can it be denied that charges which were in the nature of hideous charges have been made against Lord Spencer? It is not denied even now; and, that not being denied, are the other allegations made by my right hon. Friend denied? Is it denied that those who have made themselves conspicuous by bringing these charges against Lord Spencer and the Executive Government have obstructed legislation aimed at the prevention of crime? Is it denied that they made attacks upon the Judges, upon the Law Officers, and upon the juries? Is it denied that they have shown unbounded sympathy with murderers and criminals? [Mr. CALLAN: Yes.] I expected that that allegation would be denied. It is quite certain that unbounded sympathy has been shown by hon. Members of this House with men whom they may perhaps consider innocent, but whom they have seen convicted by the tribunals of their country after a full and legal trial, and whom I am entitled equally to consider as murderers and criminals. And I say it is notorious that sympathy of the most open and unblushing character has been shown by Members of this House with convicted murderers and criminals. Well, Sir, I am not going to attempt—this would not be the time or the occasion in which it would be possible to make any such attempt—to prove, in detail, the allegations that were made by my right hon. Friend. I could not do so without going through an immense mass of evidence and examining an immense number of speeches which have been delivered both inside and outside this House; but what I am prepared to say and aver as my own opinion, forming the best judgment that I can of the speeches—some of which I have heard and some of which I have read—made by the Members who have brought these charges against the late Irish Government, is that there is nothing in the allegations which were made by my right hon. Friend which is incapable of proof; and I believe that, if the opportunity were offered, every one of the allegations would be capable of proof. Well, then, Sir, under these circumstances, I not only concur with the right hon. Gentleman in his intention to vote against this Resolution of breach of Privilege, but I go much further than he does, and I stand by my right hon. Friend in the opportuneness of his language which has been impugned. Such a Motion as this would not only set an inconvenient precedent, but it would, in my opinion, impose a most mischievous and inconvenient restriction upon the liberty of speech; and it would, moreover, impose that restriction upon liberty of speech in favour of those who are endeavouring to subvert the Government of this country, and who are endeavouring to subvert the cause of law and order in Ireland. I say, Sir, it would impose a restriction upon freedom of speech in favour of those men as against the loyal and law-abiding portion of the population of this country; and I must say I am astonished that such a Motion should have been brought forward by any Member of the Irish Party. I cannot believe that it has been brought forward with the general assent of the Members of the Irish Party. I cannot believe that men who have habitually allowed themselves such liberties —indeed, I think I may say such licence —of speech as many of that Party have indulged in, would be the men to come whining to this House to complain, upon the first occasion, that one of the greatest orators in this House has expressed to the people in this country, in language which I believe is admitted to be true by nine-tenths of the people of this country, the opinions he holds as to the conduct which has been pursued by some of those Members.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: I may say, on behalf of my Colleagues and of myself, that we have seen with considerable satisfaction that the Head of the Liberal Party in this House has adopted the language of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright). I am delighted to have the opportunity of knowing exactly the position in which the Liberal Party stand in regard to the Irish Party. The noble Marquess who has just sat down has adopted the language of the right hon. Gentleman. That language, if used in this House, would be, admittedly, a breach of the Privileges of the House. I should have thought that the adoption, by a Member speaking inside the House, of language used by another Member outside the House, which if used in the House would have been admittedly a breach of Privilege, amounts to the same thing as making use of that language in the House, and that the noble Marquess, in so adopting the disorderly language of the right hon. Gentleman, is himself guilty of a breach of the Privileges of the House. The noble Marquess has spoken of hideous charges made against the late Lord Lieutenant, and he adopts the charges made by the right hon. Member for Birmingham against us. What are those charges? That we are disloyal; that we have unbounded sympathy with murderers; and that we have done everything in our power to rescue murderers from punishment. And when an hon. Member complains of a right hon. Gentleman for accusing Members of this House of being traitors and sympathizing with assassins and perjurers, he is said to have come whining to the House. The noble Marquess has said that these charges were not made against the Irish Party in the House, but against particular individuals; but I will point out that the charges which have been made against Lord Spencer have been made by the Irish Party as a body. We stand by those charges as a body, and we will allow of no separation of one individual from another as Members of that Party. We all have made them, and we all believe in them, and we all stand together as a Party, with no discrimination between one man and another. Therefore the charges of the right hon. Gentleman were made against the Party, and not against any individual Member of the Party. The noble Marquess has spoken of the slander which has been cast upon the Administration of the late Lord Lieutenant. Before this debate closes I hope the House will hear a few words from some other Member of the Front Opposition Bench. The right hon. Gentleman the junior Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) has taken his seat since this debate began. Does the right hon. Gentleman believe in the policy of Lord Spencer? Has he not, on the very first occasion, taken the opportunity of denouncing a policy which was inseparably connected and associated with the conduct of Lord Spencer. Therefore, if I am to be accused of slandering Lord Spencer, I am quite content to take my share of the vituperation of the noble Marquess in the goodly company of the right hon. Gentleman the junior Member for Birmingham and the right hon. Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke.) The right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) has laid down a perfectly new doctrine, which is certainly astonishing in a Radical Representative in this House, that the words, and the person, and the conduct of the Viceroy of Ireland are to be held as sacred as the words and the person of the Sovereign herself. But does not the right hon. Gentleman, and everybody in his senses, recognize the fact that the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland is an active Member of a great political Party, and as such is liable to the same criticism as any other Member of the late Government? What are the charges of the right hon. Member for Birmingham? The right hon. Gentleman has complained of the association of the Irish Party with America; but if there is one man more than another who has tied that association closely together, and who has fervently and zealously preached the doctrine of the association of the Irish in Ireland with the Irish in America, it is the right hon. Gentleman himself. Taking a cursory glance at the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman I find that he has pointed out this—

> "We may depend upon it that the Irish in America who have left this country and settled there, with so strong a feeling of hostility to British rule, have had their reasons; and if, being there imbued with that feeling of affection for their native country which, in all other cases in which we are not concerned, we should admire and reverence, they interfere in Irish matters, and have stirred up the sedition which now exists, we may depend upon it that it is because there is in the condition of Ireland a state of things which greatly favours their attempts."

That is a passage from a speech delivered by the right hon. Gentleman in the year 1866. And what was the condition of Ireland then? Then, again, in a speech delivered on the 30th of October, in the same year, the right hon. Gentleman reminded his hearers that when a follower of Mahomet engaged in prayer he turned his face towards Mecca. So, also, the Irish peasant, when he asked for food, and the blessing of Providence, turns his eyes to the setting sun, and, in spirit, grasped hands with the West. What was the situation of Ireland at that time? In 1865 there had been a Fenian outbreak, and in 1867 there was another. And anybody who knows anything of Irish history knows that insurrection is born, organized, sustained, and largely developed by the Irish in America. In these two cases both outbreaks were brought about by the Irish in America; and the right hon. Gentleman, with all the resources of his eloquence, eulogized the teaching of Irish history, and drew, from the disaffection of the Irish in America and their association with the Irish in Ireland, a moral as to the evils of the system of Government under which Ireland was ruled. At the present moment, if I wanted to stimulate my countrymen in America towards giving us assistance in the movement in which we are engaged, I would not use any weak words of my own, but I would quote the eloquent language of the right hon. Gentleman. The second charge of the right hon. Gentleman against the Irish Party is that they have had boundless sympathy with crime and criminals, with assassins and assassination. I have not been able to find, in this expurgated edition of the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman, any of his speeches bearing upon that question; but I have a perfect recollection of some of them. And I would ask what was the meaning of language like this, "That if it were not for English troops the Irish Land Question would have been settled before this, or the Irish landlords would have been assassinated by wholesale?" That is the language, or practically the language, which was used by the right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Birmingham at a time when the assassination of landlords was rife in Ireland; and to say that there would be wholesale assassination of landlords in Ireland until the Irish Land Question was settled was certainly to be guilty of sympathizing and giving encouragement to assassination. What did the right hon. Gentleman say on another occasion? Speaking of the outrages which had been committed in Ireland, he deplored them; but at the same time he admitted their necessity, and almost eulogized them. What the right hon. Gentleman stated was that crime and outrage were necessary, if only to serve for a beacon and warning to statesmen who were to come after. Could any words be a more direct encouragement, incitement, and eulogy to crime and outrage in Ireland? And yet he has now the coolness to attack us, who sympathize with our brethren in Ireland, for having exhibited boundless sympathy with crime in that country. I am extremely glad that the right hon. Gentleman and the noble Marquess have taken up the position they have on this subject. There are several hon. Members now sitting on the Liberal Benches who owe their seats to Irish votes in English and Scotch constituencies, and who obtained those votes by a distinct pledge to oppose coercion in season and out of season. I would appeal to those hon. Members and their own consciences to say whether they have kept that pledge; but, as I have no very great confidence in the tribunal to which I appeal, I will appeal to another—to the Irish voters in England—before whom they will have to appear before long; and, in view of the charges brought against the Irish Members by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham, who has denounced them as disloyal, as perjurers, and as sympathizers with crime and outrage, and by the noble Marquess, I would urge them to vote against all Liberal candidates at the next General Election. I hope that my hon. Friend will withdraw the Motion. The noble Marquess is right in his supposition that the Resolution has been brought forward by the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Callan) without consultation with his Colleagues. Though I sympathize with the hon. Member's object, I would have been disposed to treat the charges of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham with scorn and contempt.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN: Sir, I must confess that I belong to an old-fashioned school of politicians. I say "old fashioned," because, in olden times, an expression of gratitude was not excluded from the consideration of the qualities of a great public man. Notwithstanding the attack which has been made upon my right hon. Friend (Mr. John Bright) to-night, I do not forget that when the position of the Roman Catholics in this House was very different to what it is now, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham endeavoured in every way to forward and assist their interests. We are favoured with the presence to-night of a distinguished Irish Ecclesiastic (Archbishop Walsh), who is now, I believe, seated beneath the Gallery. He holds a high and important position among the Roman Catholics of that country; and he will have learnt how hon. Gentlemen, who are not unaccustomed to the use of strong language themselves, especially in Ireland, treat the opinions of a right hon. Gentleman who happens to differ from them. ["Hear, hear!"] I hear the cry of "Hear, hear!" from the enthusiastic lungs of hon. Gentlemen to my left; but their position is a very different one to-night from that which it was some years ago, when they were fighting, as it were, for the very existence of their religion and their liberties as a people—when prejudice rode rampant on both sides of the House, and every effort was made to keep them out of the privileges they now enjoy. It has not flown from my memory that in those days, when we wanted an able intellect, even if accompanied by a flippant tongue, the right hon. Gentleman was always to the front, endeavouring to serve the interests of the Irish Roman Catholics. The hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) has spent some 10 minutes in reading the speeches of the right hon. Gentleman. May I ask what was his object in doing so? Was it to find fault with any of the expressions of opinion which he read from the pages of *Hansard?* Was it to disclaim any of the statements made by the right hon. Gentleman 10 or 20 years ago? Nothing of the kind. It was simply an attempt in this House, on the part of a clever pressman, to inflame public opinion in Ireland against the right hon. Gentleman by reading remarks which, at the time they were uttered, would, if the hon. Member were consistent, have met with his entire concurrence, and even be received with the highest compliments. The hon. Gentleman has used phraseology in regard to the right hon. Gentleman which, if it had been applied to hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway, he would have been the first to repudiate and resent. I have had for years the honour of the personal acquaintance of many Irish Members who sit below the Gangway; and I would repudiate, on their behalf, the charge of disloyalty, or the expression of atrocious sentiments, which, I thank God, I believe could only be justly brought against a few of them. But the right hon. Gentleman made no such charge, nor would it apply but to very few public men, and to very few writers in the public Press. I was not at Lord Spencer's dinner the other night; but either here or anywhere else, caring little for the unpopularity I may gain by it, I am ready to express my detestation of the degradation into which men can fall who are prepared to make statements, knowing that they cannot be collared for having made them. It is only an exemplification of the adage that cowards will make statements which brave men will scorn to make. And I have deeply regretted to hear an imputation cast against a man who, however rightly or wrongly he may have acted, has been actuated by a sense of conscience that he had allowed men to be sent to the gallows with the knowledge that in sending them there he was hanging innocent men. Irrespective of all considerations of entering this House again, I am here as an Irishman, and as representing thousands of other Irishmen, who will re-echo my statement, to thank Lord Spencer for the manner in which he has administered the Government of Ireland, and to assure him that we look upon the charges which have been made against him with disgust and horror.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL): I think the House will probably be of opinion that this discussion need not be very much longer continued; but before it comes to a close there are one or two observations which may possibly commend themselves to the common sense of the House; and, if not to the common sense of the House, at any rate to the common sense of the public out-of-doors. The right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) has been accused of infringing the Privileges of this House by applying to Members of this House the term "rebel," and by accusing them of disloyalty to the Crown, and of having boundless sympathy with criminals and murderers. The noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Hartington) has justified all those expressions, and has not only avowed it as his belief that those expressions are absolutely true, but he has also implied that they are expressions which may be well and conveniently used not only in public, but in Parliamentary discussion. That being so, I should like to point out to the noble Marquess and his Colleagues who sit near him how very inconvenient that might become in a future Parliament. It is possible that in the next Parliament there may be a change in the representation of Ireland, and there may be a very large Party of Irish Members in this House holding the same opinions as those who now sit below the Gangway opposite. It is also possible, though not probable, that the noble Marquess may occupy a position of authority in the next Parliament; and I should be glad to know whether he is of opinion that for Members of Parliament to bandy backwards and forwards between each other such accusations as that of being rebels, of being disloyal, and of having boundless sympathy with crime and outrage would be likely to promote the peace and harmony of the next Parliament, or the progress of Business? However, that is entirely for his own consideration; only I believe it is absolutely without precedent for a Member of this House to get up and to point to one Member after another, and say—"I do not call so-and-so a rebel," but to insinuate that there were, no doubt, others whom he did call rebels. Whether Irish Members may be rebels or not it is really not my business to say; I cannot undertake to say or offer an opinion on that point. But suppose that I, in this place, were to call the right hon. Gentleman the junior Member for Birmingham, who sits next the noble Marquess (Mr. Chamberlain), a rebel, and accuse him of being disloyal to the Crown, would the noble Marquess, if I were to make an accusation of that kind, stand by me with the same heroic courage as he has done with regard to the expressions used by the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright)? I will quote to the noble Marquess a speech made a short time ago by the right hon. Gentleman his Colleague the junior Member for Birmingham, speaking as an ex-Minister, and giving to the public the results of his experience as a Minister of nearly six years' standing. These are the words he used, and I commend them to the consideration of the House. The noble Marquess has been justly indignant, like everybody in this House outside the Irish Party, at the extravagant nature of the charges which have been brought against the personal character of Lord Spencer; but it is possible that the noble Marquess would not have been so unmeasured in his indignation if he had known of the language which had been made use of by his late Colleague with regard to the system under which the Irish Government was carried on by the Government of the noble Marquess. The right hon. Gentleman the junior Member for Birmingham, speaking at Islington on June 17, is reported to have used these words, which I do not doubt are correct, because they are remarkable words; and I am sure that if they were not correct the right hon.

Gentleman would have contradicted them—

> "I do not believe that the great majority of Englishmen have the slightest conception of the system under which this free nation attempts to rule a sister country."

This meant that the majority of Englishmen have not the smallest conception of the nature of the system by which Ireland was governed by the Colleagues of the noble Marquess. The right hon. Gentleman goes on to say—

> "It is a system which is founded on the bayonets of 30,000 soldiers, encamped permanently, as in a hostile country. It is a system as completely centralized and bureaucratic as that with which Russia governs Poland, or as that which was common in Venice under the Austrian rule."

[Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: Hear, hear!] Yes, Sir; the right hon. Gentleman cheers; but I wish to remind him and the noble Marquess that it is under that system that all the proceedings have taken place of which the Irish Members complain. The right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) justified his charge of disloyalty to the Crown on the part of the Irish Members by the fact that they had more than once asserted that the British Government was a foreign Government. That was one of his great charges; and he said that the statement that the British Government was a foreign Government justified his accusation of disloyalty to the Crown on the part of the Irish Members. Very well, then I take the words of the senior Member for Birmingham and apply them to the junior Member, because I find——[*Cries of* "Order!"]

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the noble Lord that the subject immediately before the House is whether certain expressions used by the right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) are a breach of the Privileges of this House. I have thought it my duty to remind the House of the nature of the question before the House, because the debate is now going into other matters which have nothing to do with the question whether the expressions used by the right hon. Gentleman were a breach of the Privileges of this House or not.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL): I would not have intervened in this debate, nor would I have asked the House to allow me to trespass on its time, if it had not been for the serious misconstruction which the noble Marquess opposite placed on the words of my right hon. Friend (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) when dealing with this question. It is in order to show to the House the extreme inconvenience of the Leader of the Opposition differing from the Leader of the House, and maintaining that the expressions used by the senior Member for Birmingham were not breaches of Privilege, but were, on the other hand, expressions which may be conveniently used—it is in order to show the danger of that doctrine that I am pursuing this course. The charge made by the senior Member for Birmingham was that of disloyalty to the Crown on the part of the Irish Members, and it was supported by him in his contention that the Irish Members more than once had described the British Government as a foreign Government. The junior Member for Birmingham, in the speech which I have already quoted, went on to say—

> "An Irishman at this moment cannot move a step—he cannot lift a finger in any parochial, municipal, or educational work—without being confronted, interfered with, controlled by an English official appointed by a foreign Government, and without the shadow or shade of representative authority."

The right hon. Gentleman continued—

> "I say the time has come to reform altogether the absurd and irritating anachronism which is known as Dublin Castle, and to sweep away altogether these alien Boards of foreign officials, and to substitute for them a genuine Irish Administration of purely Irish business."

I only wish to point out that if the right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Birmingham is within his right, and is acting within the privileges and custom of Parliament in applying the term "rebel," in bringing forward an accusation of disloyalty to the Crown and an accusation of sympathy with crime and outrage on the part of the Irish Party—I hold that, if that opinion of the noble Marquess is correct and founded on Parliamentary practice and Parliamentary tradition and Parliamentary precedent, if I like, or any other Member of this House likes, we should be justified in applying exactly similar charges to the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Chamberlain). It is because I believe that my right hon. Friend has advised the House rightly in this matter—it is because I believe the noble Marquess has, in defending the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. John Bright) to the extent he did, advised the House wrongly, and has set up a precedent which may be used with a fatal effect in the next Parliament, that I protest against the misinterpretation and misconstruction which the noble Marquess placed upon it.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I think, Sir, I may congratulate the hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway on one result of the Motion made to-day. It shows them and the country that the compact into which they have recently entered is still being observed by the other Party with the most praiseworthy fidelity. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) in his speech, perhaps, left something to be desired; but I am sure that the most earnest of the hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway can have nothing to complain of in the speech of the noble Lord who has just sat down. Now, Sir, the noble Lord has been good enough to call the attention of the House to some remarks which I made recently in a speech at Islington; but I do not quite follow his object in troubling the House with such a matter. It is true that he prefaced his reference to the speech by asking my noble Friend near me (the Marquess of Hartington) what he would do if the noble Lord opposite were to call me a rebel. I do not suppose that my noble Friend would be much moved; and I can assure the noble Lord that I should not, in the circumstances, if he ever likes to apply that appellation to me, trouble the House with a Motion of breach of Privilege. The noble Lord has never yet made a speech in the country which could not be made the subject of a breach of Privilege. I remember perfectly well a speech made by the noble Lord not long ago in Prince's Hall, St. James's, Piccadilly, in which he called the then Government traitors to the Queen, and traitors to the country.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL): Have you got the words?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: No; I have not got the words; but, surely, the noble Lord does not deny the general accuracy of my statement? If he does so, I will content myself by saying, in general terms, that the names which the noble Lord was in the constant habit of applying to his political opponents would have justified a Motion of breach of Privilege every week during the last five years. But, now, why does the noble Lord think that he would be justified in calling me a rebel? What was there in those paragraphs of the speech which the noble Lord quoted which would suggest any such idea? It appears that I spoke of the English Administration in Ireland as a foreign Administration, and that I spoke of the English officials as foreign officials. But does the noble Lord make that a matter of condemnation? Does he not know that this language has been used by many distinguished Members of his own Party? Does he not recollect the celebrated speech of a Gentleman who once had the confidence of the Conservative Party, Mr. Disraeli, in this House, in which he said that the Government of Ireland was an alien Government, and that the evils of Ireland proceeded from an alien Administration and an alien Church? What is the difference between alien and foreign?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL): What is the date of that speech?

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not think the date has anything to do with the question. If Mr. Disraeli might apply that language without suspicion of being a rebel, if he might call the Irish Government of his time an alien Government, I think I may also, without doubt, in my mild way, speak of the Irish Administration of my time as a foreign Administration. But the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) was good enough to say that if he were an assailant of Lord Spencer he rejoiced in being in company with me in that matter, he, also, having in his mind the same speech to which the noble Lord has referred. I cannot accept the alliance of the hon. Member for Galway on those terms. I beg to assure him that he will not find in that speech, or in any speech which I have ever made, any attack whatever upon Lord Spencer.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: Will the right hon. Gentleman pardon me? What I said was that I claimed the right hon. Gentleman as a Colleague in assailing the policy of Lord Spencer, and I went on to say that the policy of Lord Spencer in Ireland was coercion, and that that policy had been condemned by the right hon. Gentleman.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I am glad to have the explanation of the hon. Member. I was afraid that he had gone further. I have always expressed in public and in private my highest admiration for the character of Lord Spencer, and for the ability and the courage which he brought to bear in his administration of Ireland. Now, when the hon. Member goes on to say that he claims me as an ally in the condemnation of the policy of Lord Spencer. I will admit that sometimes I may have differed from him; but the point of the speech to which the hon. Member and the noble Lord have equally referred is a condemnation of the system which Lord Spencer, in common with previous Viceroys for generations, had been called upon to administer. In condemning that system I have the approval and support of Lord Spencer himself. It is perfectly well known that Lord Spencer himself has been for a long time desirous to make great and important reforms in the system of administration in Ireland. It is also well known that he himself would like to see the abolition of the Viceroyalty. Then I say that in condemning the system of administration in Ireland I have not condemned Lord Spencer or his policy. As to the charge made against my right hon. Friend and Colleague the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright), I think it is not fitting that the time of the House should be occupied with such a matter. I do not think that the Irish Members need be so very thin-skinned; for they have been accustomed to speak strongly both in this House and out of it of the public action of their opponents, and nobody has thought it worth while to challenge them. It is, moreover, difficult to understand how Irish Members can challenge the opinions expressed by my right hon. Friend, because they have themselves to-day accepted them, and accepted them cheerfully, as representing the views which they hold. My right hon. Friend said he charged some of them with being rebels, and they did not deny the charge. There was a cheer from an hon. Member below the Gangway when it was made, and I well remember a Gentleman—Mr. Dillon—a much respected Member of this House, getting up in his place and saying—"I am a rebel; and if I could I would at this moment draw the sword for Ireland;" but that in the circumstances he was unable, and it would be ridiculous for him to attempt it. Mr. Dillon openly avowed his position. Then, under the circumstances, how can hon. Gentlemen complain of being taken at their own valuation? My right hon. Friend said he charged them with obstructing measures that were designed and brought in to promote law and order. Do they deny that? Was it not the fact that they were suspended because they would not allow a certain Bill to proceed? Surely, then, it is childish to object to a statement, the truth of which is not denied by hon. Members below the Gangway, and for which they take credit and pride to themselves. Lastly, my right hon. Friend is accused of having said that they showed sympathy with criminals, and not one word of condemnation came from them of outrage and murder. Now, I myself sympathize with many of the objects of the hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway; but I do not sympathize with crime and outrage, and I do not believe that they sympathize with it either. But I must say that I regret they have not got up many times and declared their detestation of crime.

Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN: We have done it many times.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: Some hon. Member below the Gangway says that they have done it many times. No doubt, some hon. Member may have done what he says; but I am bound to say that I have never heard any kind of denunciation of crime proceeding from any of them.

Mr. O'BRIEN: I remember the right hon. Gentleman the late Home Secretary himself quoting from *United Ireland* the strongest denunciation and detestation of outrage and crime.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I do not myself remember it; but I am quite willing to accept the statement, and I rejoice to hear it. I am not accusing the hon. Member or his Colleagues—let him make no mistake about that—of sympathy with crime or disorder; but I do regret that they have not expressed their detestation of it more frequently and publicly. Many times have they got up and absolutely refused to do so.

In a speech of the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy) I remember that, on an appeal being made to him to repudiate crime and outrage, he positively refused, and he asked whether Englishmen thought they could walk over Irishmen and slap them in the face and not get a blow in return? When hon. Members are asked to condemn outrage, and in return they say—"No, we will not condemn it; but if you give us a slap in the face we will give you a blow in return," it seems difficult to believe that hon. Members seriously condemn outrage, for that is a justification of outrage. Either hon. Gentlemen condemn outrage, or they do not. If they do, I wish their condemnation of it were more public; and as long as they confine themselves to private and not public condemnation, I do not see how they can complain of the language of my right hon. Friend.

MR. SEXTON: One of the most irritating experiences which hon. Members in this part of the House have to endure is such speeches as that of the right hon. Gentleman who has just spoken—speeches from Gentlemen who are dogmatic in theory, but who are not closely acquainted with the course of private or public life in Ireland. When the right hon. Gentleman accuses the Irish Members of not having denounced crime, I am entitled to say that he exhibits an ignorance which he would correct or remove if he would only study the official reports of the proceedings of the Land League agitation. Those reports show that time after time, year after year, in season and out of season, the leaders of the Land League and of the popular movement in Ireland occupied themselves with warnings against crime and with denunciations of crime. The right hon. Gentleman has referred to a speech of my hon. and learned Friend the Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy). I can well understand the passage which he quoted, and I am prepared to justify it and adopt it; for there can be nothing more exasperating to men who have laboured to keep the people from acts of criminality than to find when they come to this House and ask for reforms, that not only are the reforms refused, but that the way of the criminal is made more easy. I am neither disappointed nor surprised by what has happened on this occasion. The language of defamation has been used outside this House against the National Party, and when complaint is made, language not distinguishable from that of insult towards them has been added in the House itself. We have been told that Irish Members have come whining to the House. Sir, so long as the cry of Ireland was a whine, it remained very little heeded here. The voice of Ireland is now uttered in a different key, and I can tell the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) that neither in this House nor out of it, in the future, will the wrongs of Ireland be stated, nor the satisfaction of her claims be demanded, in whining tones. The noble Marquess, having sat by as chairman of the banquet, and listened to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) denouncing men who are engaged in a difficult struggle for their country, has come down here to-day and formally thrown the sanction and approval of the Liberal Party over the language of the right hon. Member. No doubt, the present Government exists by the tolerance of the Opposition. The noble Marquess is conscious that the Opposition have a majority in this House; but he certainly appears to have presumed too far on the power of the Liberal Party here when he asked the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) to repeat at the Table of the House an offence which had been committed outside—when he asked the right hon. Gentleman to emphasize the shameful language which had been applied to the Irish Members, and to allow himself to be dragged behind a discredited Viceroy who had fallen in the cause of a fallen Party. Now, Sir, what are we to say of the speech of the noble Marquess? He declared that the charges of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham were true. He went a step further, and said we had been guilty of sympathy with criminals. But when his statement was challenged from these Benches, the noble Marquess proceeded to say that we may have believed the men to be innocent, but he believed them to be guilty. Now, what is the meaning of accusing men of sympathizing with people whom they know to be innocent? We feel sympathy, not with criminals, but with men whom we believe, and whom we know, to have been brought to the gallows when innocent, with men whom we believe and know to be suffering the horrors of penal servitude for crimes of which they were not guilty. What is to become of argument and common sense if men are to be charged with sympathizing with criminals, because they sympathize with men whom in their hearts and souls they believe to be innocent, and because in that sympathy and belief they are sustained by the prelates and clergymen of Ireland, and by the general body of public opinion in that country? Sympathy with criminals! We brought forward one case. Has the noble Marquess forgotten the case of Kilmartin? That was the only case in which an inquiry was ever granted. Kilmartin was proved to be innocent, and he walked out of prison a free man. What is the audacity of any person who rises in this House and charges us with having sympathy with criminals when, in the only case in which you acceded to our demand and granted us an inquiry, the person whom you called a criminal was proved to be innocent! The noble Marquess had the courage to say that, if an opportunity were given of disproving them, the charges against Lord Spencer would be proved to be false. Why has the opportunity not been given? What is the offence charged against us in regard to the proceedings of this House? Our offence is that we have repeatedly come forward with these charges against Lord Spencer and his Administration, and that we have asked that you should give us the opportunity of proving whether our charges were true. That opportunity has always been refused us. It was nothing less than audacious, and it must command the condemnation of every reasonable man and every lover of fair play, for the noble Marquess to say that if the opportunity were given these charges would be proved to be false, seeing that our complaint against his own Government is that they have for the last three years used their power in the House to refuse us the opportunity we asked of proving our charges. Now, I have seen a paragraph in an influential Liberal paper, in which it is said that the speech of the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Bright) has excited the most intense indignation amongst the Irish Members. Now, while I say that my hon. Friend the Member for Louth (Mr. Callan) was within his right in bringing forward this question to-day, I am bound to add that the Irish Party in this House have not made this question a Party one. It has not come before them for their consideration. Indeed, if it had, they would have come to the conclusion to treat the language of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham with the contempt that, in my opinion, it deserves. I am, for my own part, opposed in principle to any appeals from Irish Members to this House to protect them against language used against them. We are in a minority, we are fighting against odds, and from what I know of the history of England, and from what I have learnt by my experience here in the course of the last five years, I know that the Representatives of any people subject to you and fighting you against odds, if they do their duty honestly and with courage, will have to face every accusation that malignity can devise and language make. Personally, I am perfectly indifferent to any accusation any Englishman makes against me. I maintain that, as this question of Privilege has been brought forward, it will be no discredit if the hon. Member fails on this occasion, and neither will it be any triumph for him to succeed. The force before us is the force of the Irish people. The opinion to which we appeal is their opinion. We are perfectly certain that accusations of every kind will be made by Englishmen against us so long as we give them trouble and inconvenience; and, for my part, it is a matter of absolute and complete indifference to me what charge any Englishman brings against me in my public capacity, and what action the House of Commons may take, or refuse to take, in regard to me. But, Sir, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham is certainly one who ought to be slow to indulge in language of this kind. He has spent, if not the best, the most vigorous part of his life in the conduct of violent agitation, and agitation the course of which was not always unmarked by disorder and by crime. Licentiousness of language with regard to his opponents has been the main characteristic of his life, and his career and age, instead of bringing to him dignity or reserve, has only weakened his judgment. While he has been singularly reckless and unscrupulous in the language he has applied to others, he has always shown a childish sensitiveness with regard to the language applied to him. He says if he had made any other speech than the speech he did make, he might have been called a fool. I do not think that Parliamentary Forms would allow me to suggest to the House what I should like to suggest; but as a specimen of the powers of judgment of the right hon. Gentleman, I would say that his main charge against us—that we have been disloyal to the Crown—rests upon two arguments, one of which is inapplicable, and the other of which is absurd. How has he supported his argument with reference to the Oath of Allegiance? He has suggested that men in this House who have taken the Oath of Allegiance are disloyal, because a gentleman outside of this House, whom he knows, refuses to come to the House on the ground that he would have to take the Oath of Allegiance. I will leave it to the House to say whether the conduct of an eminent Irishman outside the House can have the slightest possible bearing on the conduct and principles of those who have come into the House according to the prescribed code. What is the other argument? That we have been disloyal to Lord Spencer. Would it not be well of the right hon. Gentleman to learn the meaning of "disloyal" before he again speaks upon the subject? But I would pause for a moment, and say that Irishmen have always shown more respect for the Throne and its occupant, and more chivalry in their references to the Monarchy of this country, than have been shown by certain sections of politicians and certain organs of opinion in England. But are we obliged to be loyal to any Gentleman who is sent as Viceroy to Ireland, who is sent there as the agent of a political Party, who is sent there to carry out the policy of a Party, and who falls, as Lord Spencer fell, by a vote of this House? Our business here is to criticize the public policy of the Government, and is it not manifestly absurd to suggest to us that we are not to criticize and even to denounce the policy of a Viceroy in Ireland, since the Viceroy in Ireland falls by a vote of this House? What is called disloyalty in regard to the Viceroy is one of the most manifest duties of Irish Members of Parliament when the Viceroy so conducts himself as, in their opinion, to outrage the public opinion of their country. It is said we have obstructed all legislation directed against crime. I remember one measure against crime which was passed by this House at a single Sitting, without a word of comment from one Irish Member. In that the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt) will bear me out. We have been charged with attacking indiscriminately every jury who found men guilty in Ireland. I do not remember that, during my experience in the House of Commons, a grave attack has been made upon any jury but one. We gravely attacked, and we seriously impugned, the jury who returned the verdict against Francis Hynes. We did so, because it was proved by an abundance of sworn evidence that some of the jury who sent Francis Hynes to the gallows passed the night preceding the verdict in riotous behaviour at the hotel, and were actually drunk when they gave their verdict. That fact was fully established, and no serious attempt was ever made to refute it. In regard to other juries, it is not the juries themselves whom we have attacked, but the process of packing them. If you pack a jury, it is not the jury so much we blame as the people who pack them. If you put into the box 12 men saturated with political passion they may honestly, by the force of their prejudice, find a man guilty against whom the evidence is insufficient, and in such a case the person whose conduct is contested is the official of the Crown, who boldly stands there and sets aside every man who would be likely to give an adverse opinion. Now, as to the charges against Lord Spencer. The main charges against Lord Spencer are two in number—namely, that he shielded officials accused of the most detestable crime; and that when the Prerogative of mercy might properly have been exercised, he refused to exercise it. Take the first charge. The prospects of my hon. Friend the Member for Mallow (Mr. O'Brien) were in danger, his liberty was in peril, his very life was in jeopardy, because he dared to declare that Castle officials had been guilty of an infamous and unspeakable crime. Month after month passed by; Question after Question was put unavailingly in the House of Commons; debate after debate was raised, yet the infamous French still continued to wield power in the Irish Constabulary Force. The detectives who should have been engaged in the vindication of justice were employed to dog and threaten my hon. Friend. Through danger and trouble, through unspeakable difficulty and peril, my hon. Friend succeeded in making good his accusation, and the man who held one of the chief positions in Dublin Castle is now atoning his infamy in penal servitude in the garb of the convict. Every obstacle that could be thrown in my hon. Friend's way—by the long delay in the Courts, by the obstinacy of the high officials in Dublin Castle—was thrown in his way. But the conviction now stands on the Records, and no dinners can revoke it, no lofty appeals to the chivalry of the Members of this House can alter it. Lord Spencer and his Administration did shield the unspeakable criminal French, so long as shielding him was possible. Not only did they do that, but they almost accomplished the ruin of the brave and courageous Irishman who set out on the tract of the man; and if that Irishman vindicated his action, if he justified his course, and if he secured the punishment of the criminal, it was the mercy of Providence and not the will or cooperation of Lord Spencer that was to be thanked for it. Our charge, therefore, that Lord Spencer shielded infamous criminals is proved beyond denial. The second charge is, that Lord Spencer refused to exercise the Prerogative of mercy. What did Lord Spencer say at the dinner at the Westminster Palace Hotel? He said that during his Viceroyalty 40 men had been condemned to death, and of them 21 had been executed. Now, in regard to how many of the 21 have we impeached the verdicts? Of the 21 cases in which Lord Spencer declared that the law should take its course, I do not know that we have ever questioned more than five. What is the meaning of saying we have questioned all the verdicts? Out of the 21 executions, there are 16 the justice of which has never been impeached by any Member of the House. Are we to attribute it to the rage of a defeated Administration that accusations, grossly and flagrantly inconsistent with the facts, are made against us by men occupying high positions in this House? What happened in the case of Myles Joyce? Three men were sentenced to death, and lodged in Galway Gaol. Two of those men, inspired by their spiritual guides, standing upon the verge of the scaffold, made declarations in which they asserted the innocence of Myles Joyce. The declarations were forwarded to Lord Spencer in ample time for him to have stopped the execution of the victim. The night before the execution of Myles Joyce, the telegraph office at Galway was kept open, such was the expectation that, upon examining the evidence Lord Spencer would order the execution to be stayed. What could have been more conclusive? Two of the three men declared the innocence of the third, and admitted their own guilt. To any man who reflects on the case, it will be apparent that if the proof of the innocence of Myles Joyce was not clear, there was established such presumption as should have compelled Lord Spencer, if he had been moved by any impulse other than a desire for vengeance and a disposition to strike terror into the people by the execution of the man, to, at least, have reprieved the prisoner and given time for a due investigation of the case. Well, Sir, I say that we have not generally and universally impeached Judges, juries, and Law Officers in Ireland. There are many Judges in Ireland whose conduct has never been seriously attacked; there are many officials against whom a word of attack has never been uttered in this House; there are many juries against whom there has not been a breath of imputation. The accusations we have made in certain cases we have supported by proofs; and if we wanted any justification of our conduct, it may be found in the fact that the one inquiry which we obtained resulted in the proof of the innocence of the man, that of the Crown officials whom we have impeached one, an uncertificated bankrupt, and another, a defrauder of his own wife, have been practically cast out of employment, and that the policy of coercion, the policy which we attacked and denounced in this House, is now declared by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham himself to have been a mistake, and is cast aside as a discredited weapon by the Government who are now responsible for the administration of the affairs of the country. I consider that the right hon. Gentleman has aggravated his original offence by the speech he has delivered here to-day, for he has not only maintained the truth and accuracy of his utterances the other night, but he has referred individually to Members of this Party, who, I think, take his references more as a compliment than as anything else. He has, at the same time, pointed his innuendoes and calmunies by inference against Members he did not name. It is not by the good opinion of the right hon. Gentleman, or of any Member of this House, that we, the Irish Party, live and thrive. We have lived and thriven not by your favour, but in your despite. That we have the support of our own countrymen, and that the policy which we have pursued has improved the prospects of our own cause, is amply proved by our power in the House at the present moment, and the prospects which lie immediately before us. The Liberal organ I have already quoted says the real object of the banquet the other night was to bolster up and whitewash a discredited and disgraced politician; but it had another object—namely, to bring home the real character of the Irish Party. The language of the right hon. Gentleman, it was said, will ring through the country at the General Election. But there are other words besides those of the right hon. Gentleman which will ring through the country at the General Election. When that General Election comes round it will not be forgotten that, to the slanderous speech of the right hon. Member for Birmingham at the Spencer dinner, there was added the insulting speech of the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) here to-day. By the proceedings of to-day the Liberal Party have been made responsible for the speech of the right hon. Member for Birmingham. Our countrymen in America were driven from their country by your laws; they were the friends of Ireland before the right hon. Member for Birmingham posed as its friend; they are the friends of Ireland now that he has become its enemy, and they will continue to be friends of Ireland when the right hon. Member for Birmingham is no more, and when English Parties have little to do with the government of Ireland. Sir, if the Irish Party had adjudged upon this question, they never would have appealed to you for justice. We have no confidence in the impartiality of this House as between Englishmen and Irishmen. We are indifferent to the proceedings of this day, to any accusations made here to-day, to any charges which may be brought against us hereafter. As to the right hon. Member for Birmingham, to whom age has not brought either scruple in attack, or dignity and frankness in self-defence, what has occurred to-day will be of some advantage to him, if it teaches him even at this eleventh hour of his life that he ought to govern his language by the principles of truth and have some regard for the demands of decency.

MR. O'BRIEN: I do not intend to prolong this discussion for more than a minute or two; but as I am one of those included in the compliment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright), I must join with my hon. Friend (Mr. Sexton) in regretting that the hon. Member for Louth (Mr. Callan) should have thought it worth while to make any appeal to the House in this matter. Speeches of the character of the right hon. Gentleman's speech at the banquet the other night, and of the character of the speech which we have listened to from him to-day, may possibly give pain to the very few friends of his who still cling to the memory of his former friendship for Ireland; but such speeches do not, in the slightest degree, distress those whom the right hon. Gentleman is pleased to honour by his enmity. The right hon. Gentleman accuses us of being disloyal, and of being rebels. If he means that we are disloyal to Earl Spencer and to English rule in Ireland, then all I can say is that there is not very much difference of opinion between us. I, for one, am rather disposed to accept it as a compliment. The right hon. Gentleman accuses us of boundless sympathy with criminals; but when such an accusation is made by an old and feeble and somewhat broken man, I doubt if it matters much. It is a very different thing, however, when the accusation is taken up and endorsed and justified by the responsible Leader of the Liberal Party in the House of Commons. Sir, if the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) who leads the Liberal Party in the House at the present time, thinks that it is well within the privilege of Members of this House to call certain hon. Members perjurers and sympathizers with murder, I regret that the Privileges of Parliament are not a little further extended, and that it is not possible for us to call men calumniators and liars. All the charges we ever made against Lord Spencer we made openly and in the light of day, and with the knowledge that in making them we carried our lives in our hands. We have not only made them, but we stick to them now. We have proved them up to the hilt in the estimation of nineteenth-twentieths of the Irish race throughout the world, and allow me to tell you that these are the persons whose verdict we think something of. I can only speak of the language of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham with the utmost levity and contempt. Considering the right hon. Gentleman's state of mind for the last couple of years with regard to Ireland, and with regard to Members from Ireland, I can only say that the only thing that has alarmed me is that he has discovered anything in our conduct which has merited a testimonial from him. I do not know whether my hon. Friend the Member for Louth (Mr. Callan) means to push this matter to a division; but if the Motion is negatived, it will, at all events, have just one useful result—it will show what a different measure of justice is meted out to English and Irish Members in this House, though, in my opinion, that does not need very much further illustration.

Mr. JUSTIN HUNTLY M'CARTHY: Mr. Speaker, for my own part I do not care in the least what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) may say of any Member of the Irish Party. I feel convinced that there is no Irish Nationalist in the country who will regard otherwise than with supreme indifference any attack which an exploded politician like the right hon. Gentleman may make upon us. The right hon. Gentleman was our friend, he is now our enemy, and I personally much prefer him in the latter capacity, because he is less dangerous to the country and less able to delude the people. I will not comment upon the speech of the junior Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), except to say that there was something in that speech which suggested to me that the right hon. Gentleman was a little disappointed by the tone in which the Irish Press and the Irish people have responded to his promised crusade in Ireland. We were not enthusiastic at the generous offer which was made to us by the right hon. Gentleman, and hence, I think, his tone of bitterness and the unfair accusations which he made to-night against the Irish people and their Representatives. Now, the noble Marquess (the Marquess of Hartington) who leads the Opposition, and who, I hope, will long continue to lead the Opposition, said that hideous charges had been made against Lord Spencer. We have a right to bring such charges against a man who, we think, has been the cause of great and lasting injury to our country, and whose name will be hated for generations to come, hated even more than the name of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster). The right hon. Gentleman (Mr. John Bright) said that sympathy has been shown by Members of this House — and by that he meant Members on these Benches—with convicted criminals. Of course, we have sympathy with some convicted criminals. There never was a Party in this House who had not, at one time or other, had sympathy with them. When we look back, we find that the most exalted names in Irish history are to be found amongst those of convicted criminals. What were Robert Emmet, Smith O'Brien, and Meagher but convicted criminals; and what were the three men who were done to death at Manchester but convicted criminals? It is impossible for any Irish Nationalist not to have sympathy with such men as these. The result of the conviction of such criminals has been that the English Flag is as much hated in Ireland, as the Austrian Eagle was hated in Hungary, and the Russian Eagle in Poland. I hope that the time will never come when Irish Nationalist Members will not be proud and glad to be accused of sympathy with such convicted criminals as I have referred to.

Mr. O'KELLY: Sir, I have listened to the debate with a certain amount of interest not unmingled with a little amusement. The debate has been exceedingly instructive as showing the disposition of English Members towards our people and our cause, as well as the difficulty of getting anything like fair play in this House. But it certainly requires some coolness on the part of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright) and his Friends to accuse us of unbounded sympathy with crime. I would recommend those Gentlemen who can to look into their own consciences, and to go back into the history of the past two years, and remember that they are steeped up to the ancles in human blood. The last thing we shall remember of the senior Member for Birmingham is that he will go down to history as one of the assassins of Alexandria. In this House, at any rate, those Gentlemen ought to be careful how they bandy words and make sweeping accusations against our men. In the case of Ireland, when we have challenged the course of justice, we have challenged each case upon its merits. We, acting upon our belief and upon the evidence before us, have challenged the action of Lord Spencer in certain cases, and we have also challenged the manner in which justice has been administered, and the manner in which juries have been packed; but we have never attacked every act of the Government. We have made a distinction always between those men who have been justly convicted of criminal acts, and those who, in our opinion, have not. No Member of this Party, so far as my memory leads me back, has ever said one word in defence of men who were fairly and honestly convicted, or men who deserved to be convicted. The men we have spoken in favour of are men whom you have brought into your net by an infamous system, men whom you have sacrificed even at the expense of innocent men's lives. I think that no man who looks back for the last year, and examines carefully the cases which have been brought before the House—no fair-minded man can say that we have attacked Lord Spencer, or any of the judicial officers in Ireland, in any case where we have not had a fair case as against the administration of justice. I regret, however, that my hon. Friend the Member for Louth (Mr. Callan) has thought it well to bring this case before the House. I think it below the dignity of Irish Members to pay any attention to such attacks, coming from any quarter. We know very well that, in politics, the Party to which the senior Member for Birmingham belongs are very unscrupulous even among themselves, and that, when dealing with us, they have no sense of justice, honour, or duty.

MR. T. D. SULLIVAN: Sir, I wish to address myself to that passage of the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the junior Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) in which he alleged that there had been no expression of disapproval of crime and outrage in Ireland from the lips of the Leaders of the Irish people. He said that he did not at all charge them with having any sympathy with those outrages; but he expressed regret that they did not declare their want of sympathy with them, and express their disapproval of the various crimes and outrages which had been committed. I think, Sir, before he stood up at the Table to make that statement, he ought to have made himself acquainted with the actual facts, because his statement shows either his ignorance of the subject, or his malice in making it. I utterly deny the truth of his allegation, and I assert emphatically that again and again, in the Press and on the platform, the Leaders of the Irish Party have denounced, condemned, and protested against the perpetration of crime and outrage. My allegations on this matter I could sustain by quotations; I could bring before this House plenty of proofs of my statement, but I will not do anything of the sort. Whenever we are met with these odious charges, we will not come down with bundles of papers and extracts from newspapers, and ask the House to listen to them in our behalf. We will go into no such defence; but, on the other hand, we will meet those who bring these charges with as blunt and strong a denial as would be permitted within the bounds of Parliamentary language. When I heard the right hon. Gentleman the junior Member for Birmingham taking that line to-night, it indicated one thing to my mind—namely, that his Irish tour is to be abandoned. I venture to say that after that statement of his, he would not dare to present himself before the people of Ireland, and ask their opinion of either his conduct or his policy. This debate has been more prolonged than I suppose any of us anticipated. It has been truly said that the subject has been brought forward without any general concert with the Irish Members. We, in reference to such allegations as have been made in this House, place our conduct and reputation before the Irish people for their judgment, and not before the House of Commons. It is perfectly manifest to us that if other Members of this House, of less distinction than the right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright), had used such language as he used, and before such distinguished company—if Irish Members had used such language with respect to Members of the House, they would not have been treated with as much consideration as has been shown to him this evening. The right hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Birmingham was at one time very friendly to Ireland—at least, he was supposed to be so, and in those days for his good words and good intentions we gave him credit; but because the Irish people have chosen to go a little further and faster than is pleasing to the right hon. Gentleman, he now turns round on us, and pours out all the bitterness that he has stored up in his old age. We shall leave this matter now, because we have more serious things before us, and we claim that we stand here with a reputation as high and solid as that of the right hon. Gentleman. We have stood by the Irish people in times of trial, suffering, and temptation, and our conduct has conduced much to lighten the oppression of which we disapproved, and break the chains of their bondage. I contend that the allegation that we have not expressed disapprobation of crime and outrage is a false allegation. I maintain that we have done our duty to our country, to justice and to religion; and being satisfied with our conduct in that respect, we can afford to treat as of very little importance such charges made in an after-dinner speech by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham.

Mr. CALLAN: Sir, the object with which I brought forward this Resolution having been attained, I have to say that for the language itself, coming from the quarter it did, I entertained personally the most supreme contempt. I brought forward the Resolution in no sense as an appeal to the House of Commons, either for sympathy or justice. I had no confidence whatever in either the sympathy or justice of this House, and I did not bring it forward for the purpose of narrowing liberty of speech outside or inside Parliament. I brought it forward, on the contrary, for the purpose of extending that liberty of speech, and I am glad that I have attained that object with reference to debate inside this House; for I knew, Sir, when I placed my Notice in your hands, that it would, on a division, meet with overwhelming defeat. But the House has so expressed itself that now it is on record that to charge a Member of this House with disloyalty to the Crown, with perjury, and with sympathy for crime and murder, is within Parliamentary bounds; and you, Sir, having permitted the noble Marquess the present Leader on the Front Opposition Bench to endorse the infamous charges made by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright), and the noble Marquess having endorsed those charges without rebuke from you, we, of course, shall be at liberty, when occasion arises, to pay him back in his own coin. Now, as to the words "boundless sympathy with convicts and crime," I am glad to have that as a Parliamentary expression, because I will use that expression during next week on the Appropriation Bill, with reference to Members on the Front Opposition Bench. I am glad that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department was present when that language was used by the noble Marquess, and that you, Sir, by allowing it to pass without rebuke, have allowed it to become a Parliamentary expression. If any man not older than myself, were he a Member of this House or not, told me to my face——

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is altogether deviating from the subject before the House.

Mr. CALLAN: Then, Sir, I say that, so far from coming here in a whining spirit, I came here to get an endorsement of these words, not believing that they would be repudiated. If the language applied to me in the Westminster Hotel on Friday night, of having boundless sympathy with criminals and murderers, was applied to me under other circumstances, I would resort to the natural application of superior force.

So much, Sir, for coming here in a whining spirit. I am also glad to bring forward this Resolution, because after the speech of the noble Marquess, and the speeches of the two right hon. Members for Birmingham, the Irish people in England, and wherever they have the power in their hands, will require no inducement from us not to further the political interests of the noble Marquess and the two right hon. Gentlemen. Having obtained what I desired —namely, an enlargement of the field of discussion, and the adoption of these terms as a Parliamentary expression—I beg leave to withdraw my Motion.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it your pleasure that the Motion be withdrawn? [*Cries of* "No, no!"]

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 23; Noes 154: Majority 131.

AYES.

Barry, J.
Biggar, J. G.
Dawson, C.
Deasy, J.
Gray, E. D.
Kenny, M. J.
Leahy, J.
Leamy, E.
Lynch, N.
M'Carthy, J.
M'Carthy, J. H.
M'Kenna, Sir J. N.
Marum, E. M.
Molloy, B. C.
Nolan, Colonel J. P.
O'Connor, A.
O'Connor, T. P.
O'Kelly, J.
Power, P. J.
Power, R.
Sexton, T.
Sullivan, T. D.
Synan, E. J.

TELLERS.

Callan, P.
O'Brien, W.

NOES.

Acland, rt. hn. Sir T. D.
Agnew, W.
Ainsworth, D.
Armitstead, G.
Asher, A.
Ashley, hon. E. M.
Ashmead-Bartlett, E.
Atkinson, H. J.
Balfour, rt. hon. A. J.
Balfour, rt. hon. J. B.
Balfour, Sir G.
Barran, J.
Barttelot, Sir W. B.
Beach, right hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-
Beaumont, W. B.
Beresford, G. De la P.
Bolton, J. C.
Borlase, W. C.
Bourke, right hon. R.
Brand, hon. H. R.
Bright, J.
Brodrick, hon. W. St. J. F.
Brogden, A.
Bryce, J.
Buchanan, T. R.
Bulwer, J. R.
Burt, T.
Buxton, S. C.
Cartwright, W. C.
Causton, R. K.
Cavendish, Lord E.
Chamberlain, rt. hn. J.
Chaplin, rt. hon. H.
Cheetham, J. F.
Churchill, rt. hn. Lord R. H. S.
Clark, S.
Cohen, A.
Colebrooke, Sir T. E.
Corry, J. P.
Craig, W. Y.
Cropper, J.
Cross, rt. hon. Sir R. A.
Dalrymple, C.
Davey, H.
Dawnay, hon. G. C.
De Worms, Baron H.
Dillwyn, L. L.
Duff, R. W.
Dyke, rt. hn. Sir W. H.
Errington, Sir G.
Ewart, W.
Fairbairn, Sir A.
Findlater, W.
Fletcher, Sir H.
Floyer, J.
Foljambe, C. G. S.
Folkestone, Viscount
Forster, Sir C.
Fowler, W.
Fremantle, hon. T. F.
Fry, L.
Gladstone, H. J.
Gladstone, W. H.
Goldney, Sir G.
Gordon, Sir A.
Gorst, J. E.
Gower, hon. E. F. L.
Gregory, G. B.
Grey, A. H. G.
Grosvenor, right hon. Lord R.
Hamilton, right hon. Lord G. F.
Harcourt, rt. hn. Sir W. G. V. V.
Hartington, Marq. of
Hastings, G. W.
Hayter, Sir A. D.
Henderson, F.
Herbert, hon. S.
Herschell, Sir F.
Hill, Lord A. W.
Hill, T. R.
Holland, Sir H. T.
Hollond, J. R.
Holmes, rt. hon. H.
Hopwood, C. H.
Ince, H. B.
Jenkins, Sir J. J.
Jenkins, D. J.
Kensington, rt. hn. Lord
Kinnear, J.
Labouchere, H.
Lawrence, Sir J. C.
Lawrence, W.
Lawson, Sir W.
Lewisham, Viscount
M'Arthur, A.
M'Clure, Sir T.
M'Coan, J. C.
M'Lagan, P.
Manners, rt. hon. Lord J. J. R.
Mappin, F. T.
Marjoribanks, hon. E.
Morley, A.
Morley, S.
Mundella, rt. hn. A. J.
O'Brien, Sir P.
Palmer, C. M.
Parker, C. S.
Pease, A.
Picton, J. A.
Playfair, rt. hn. Sir L.
Plunket, rt. hon. D. R.
Power, J. O'C.
Pulley, J.
Ralli, P.
Ramsay, J
Rathbone, W.
Reid, R. T.
Repton, G.. W.
Richard, H.
Ritchie, C. T.
Robertson, H.
Roe, T.
Russell, G. W. E.
Russell, T.
Rylands, P.
St. Aubyn, Sir J.
Selwin - Ibbetson, rt. hon. Sir H. J.
Severne, J. E.
Shaw, T.
Shield, H.
Simon, Serjeant J.
Sinclair, W. P.
Smith, rt. hon. W. H.
Smith, S.
Stanhope, rt. hon. E.
Stanley, rt. hon. Col. F.
Stanley, hon. E. L.
Stuart, J.
Summers, W.
Sutherland, T.
Tavistock, Marquess of
Tennant, Sir C.
Tollemache, H. J.
Trevelyan, rt. hn. G. O.
Waddy, S. D.
Waugh, E.
Webster, Sir R. E.
Webster, J.
West, H. W.
Whitbread, S.
Williamson, S.
Wodehouse, E. R.
Woodall, W.
Wortley, C. B. Stuart-

TELLERS.

Akers-Douglas, A.
Walrond, Col. W. H.

ORDER OF THE DAY.

——o——

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Supply—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £11,128, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, in aid of the Expense of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland."

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, he wished to call attention to certain circumstances in connection with the Vote before the Committee, and he would do so in consequence of the absence of his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). His hon. Friend had intended to bring this subject before the Committee, and was only prevented from doing so by a sudden and severe attack of illness. In his absence, therefore, he (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) would invite the attention of the Committee to the many anomalies connected with the system of education in Irish Colleges. It was well known that this question had engaged the attention of generations, and had again and again been taken up by successive Ministers and Statesmen who, with the very best intentions, had endeavoured to set the wrong system right; but it had, unfortunately, been found that each attempt ended, if possible, in worse failure than that which preceded it. The right hon. Gentleman whom he saw opposite (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) had taken a very leading part in this question of education in Ireland, and he did not suppose that there was a man who understood it better than the right hon. Gentleman. There was also associated with him another right hon. Gentleman, the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India (Lord Randolph Churchill), who had shown great interest in the education of the Irish people, and had, in that respect, rendered some very valuable services. He (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) thought, therefore, that the noble Lord would not be out of sympathy with him in the effort he wished to make to bring the system into accordance with the hopes and aspirations of the Irish people. He would point out that all the successive attempts which had been made to set this system right had been made in the absence of a well-defined principle. Sir Robert Peel, when about to give a system of College education to the Irish people, found out the difficulty of adopting a plan which would meet the requirements of the people of various religious persuasions. He offered to the Irish people a system of education which ignored questions of religion. He said that if you allowed religion to be mixed up in any way with education, you could not satisfy Catholics, Protestants, and Presbyterians under one system, and therefore you had better exclude religion altogether, and have one uniform secular system. That proposal was made under what seemed to be satisfactory auspices. It took with it, at first, the assent of the English people; but it should be observed that the first note of opposition was struck not by the Roman Catholics, but by a public man of another persuasion, who condemned the principle of what he called "godless Colleges." After a while, it became evident that the Catholic Church and the Irish people would not accept that system; and then another attempt was made to meet the difficulty by the establishment of the Royal University. With the Royal University were joined the Queen's Colleges of Belfast, Galway, and Cork; and to these were added the University College of Dublin, and Magee College, Belfast. These institutions opened their doors to the members of all denominations; but the Royal University gave no advantage to any but those who accepted its principles and adopted its forms. In many ways it was becoming more liberalized; but such an institution could not be accepted as a whole by the Catholics. An attempt had once been made to establish a purely Roman Catholic University in Dublin. The Irish Catholics spent, he believed, £250,000, at least, in the endeavour to establish a Catholic University for the education of the Irish people; but, of course, the difficulty was that they were competing at such tremendous odds with the establishments of the Government, and they were not able to make their degrees equally valuable with the others. After a time, the institution was remodelled and was changed into University College. No sooner did that remodelling take place, than a most remarkable phenomenon was seen — no sooner was University College put into working order, than it began to be seen that, with all its own disadvantages and with all the advantages of its rivals, it was able to hold up its head against all competition, and was enabled to carry away a larger proportion of prizes than any of the institutions endowed by the State. He held in his hand a statement of figures which showed at once the remarkable success of this Catholic institution without any State advantage, which enabled its pupils to carry off the best honours and prizes placed within their reach. Well, one appeal he had to make that night was on behalf of that institution; but he had also to appeal to the Government to tell them what they intended to do with regard to the whole system of College education in Ireland. The institutions already established were either wholly Protestant, or they professed a neutrality which the Irish people never could accept, and which was unsuitable to Irish educational purposes. The Colleges of Cork, Belfast, and Galway were well-appointed; they had efficient teachers, but they had the one great defect in the eyes of the vast bulk of the Irish people—that their education was secular. The Catholics of Ireland had endeavoured, with limited means, and in the absence of State support, to make the best way they could under immense disadvantages. He thought the time had come when the Government should make up their minds to grapple with this question; that it was now time the Government should go to work to reconstruct and re-organize the College educational system. He did not intend, and his hon. Friends did not intend, to offer any plan for the re-organization of the Colleges. It would be very unwise of any private Member to approach a Government in that House with a settled scheme. The effect of such a course would be that everyone who saw the smallest objection to any one detail would direct his attack upon that point, and the House of Commons would, in consequence, fall into a controversy of mere details. But Irish Members urged that the present Government might take the matter into their own hands, and bring in a scheme for the entire re-organization of public College education in Ireland. In doing that, they would have to recognize that the demand was merely for equality and justice. There were certain endowments, certain sums of money applicable, and certain State aid and support, and Irish Members claimed that they should be divided, so as to give the Irish people who were in the majority something like a decent proportion and share of them. He did not expect the Government to bring forward any scheme of that sort in the present Session; but he thought that they might, in the meantime, recognize the claim which University College, Dublin, had established upon them. By its title, by its purposes, that College was bound to furnish all the teaching required of it, even by a small number of pupils. If something was not done for it, it must, after a limited time, fail in its purpose, and perhaps fail altogether. He asked the Government to say whether they could not at once adopt some plan which might secure for that College something like State support. He held that the Government were bound to give some support to enable the College to carry out its purpose, and he saw no reason why that might not be done even in the present Session. He had some hope that the right hon. Baronet the Chancellor of the Exchequer, or some other Member of the Government, would be able to tell the Committee that they had made up their minds to meet Irish Members in their very reasonable demand. Of course, the settlement of the larger question connected with Irish University Education must stand over; but, in the meantime, he held that something ought to be done for an institution which was so effectually educating the Irish Catholics.

Colonel COLTHURST said, in supporting his hon. Friend the Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy), he should confine himself to the distinct proposition put forward by him at the end of his speech. In the first place, he said they had a special claim on Her Majesty's present Government. It would be remembered that in the year 1879 a proposal was put forward by The O'Conor Don, which had the approval of the Catholic population in Ireland; but Her Majesty's Government, in its wisdom, rejected that proposal, and put forward, as a counter-proposal, the scheme of the present Royal University. He (Colonel Colthurst had never depreciated the Royal University. On the contrary, he thought it most valuable, and it had shown what Catholics and Catholic institutions could do. But when it was put forward, those in that House opposed to Catholic education, and amongst them the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), pointed out that the establishment of the Royal University, which consisted of three endowed and one or two unendowed Colleges, would sound the knell of unendowed Colleges. And what had been the result? His hon. Friend the Member for Longford had stated to the Committee what had been the struggles of the Catholic University College in the commencement. He would take up the story from the year 1883. At the end of 1883 the late Cardinal M'Cabe found he could not carry it on, and it was handed over to the body now in charge of it. In the examinations of 1884 there were 139 passes from the Queen's College, Belfast, out of which 109 took honours; from Queen's College, Galway, there were 20 passes, and of these only eight were with honours. In the passes from the Catholic College, the proportion of honours to passes was very large. Let it be borne in mind that the College which obtained that success had only been one year in existence, or, rather, only one year under its present management. And what assistance did the State give to that College? About £3,000 a-year, in the shape of Fellowships—that was, it was given Fellows of the Royal University, upon whom the obligation lay of teaching in that College. In the same year the amount paid to the three Queen's Colleges—he would not go into details, but taking the total and deducting the fees received from students—there was the sum of £32,629 divided amongst them. To that must be added £5,000 a-year income upon capital expended on buildings; and that was not all, for they had, in addition, the sum of £1,500 for prizes to be competed for amongst themselves, while the whole amount for prizes at the College in question, which were competed for by students from every part of Ireland, was not, he believed, more than £1,500 a-year. He thought his hon. Friend had made out a good case for the recognition, in some way, by the State of this College in Dublin which had done such good work. He thought that—putting it upon the necessity of establishing religious equality—the demand that he made for the small sum of £6,000 a-year was unanswerable; but, putting aside religious equality, he (Colonel Colthurst) would ask for that small sum simply on the ground of educational work done. His right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair), he regretted to see was not present, because he had hoped he would have supported Irish Members in this demand. The right hon. Gentleman had hitherto opposed the demands of Irish Members, because those demands had been, from the necessity of the case during the last 10 years, limited to asking that the prizes should be taken from the Queen's Colleges and made open to all University students. The argument of the right hon. Gentleman, in which he thought there was a good deal of force, was that they would be pulling down without building up. He said, both in public and in private—"Establish a College and I will assist in the work; but I will not pull down institutions which are doing good work." They now came to Her Majesty's Government with a definite proposal; they pointed to an institution that was doing good work, and they asked for it a small sum. He appealed on this subject, with special confidence, to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), the Leader of the Government in that House; because, when officially connected with Ireland, the right hon. Gentleman had carried out a scheme of intermediate education—a most admirable scheme, and a scheme which had been of the greatest benefit to the country. Its success was owing to the boldness of the right hon. Gentleman in looking difficulties in the face and establishing, so far as that scheme was concerned, the most absolute religious equality; and he hoped it would be perfected that Session by the application of endowments now misapplied. With his hon. Friend, he did not say that the granting of the concession asked for that night would be a settlement of the whole question. Far from it. The Catholics of Ireland were determined that they must have equality in one way or another. They would very much prefer equality in the sense of building up; but equality they must have, and he felt they were certain to have it, if not by building up, by levelling down—by taking away, or by interfering with, the endowments of the Queen's Colleges. They fully admitted that the Queen's College, Belfast, had done good work, and was doing admirable work; but it was almost entirely a Presbyterian College. They admitted that the Queen's College at Cork was doing a certain amount of work, and that, from the necessity of the case, many Catholics in Cork were obliged to take advantage of it, because there was no other place for them to go to. With regard to Galway College, he thought the best thing would be to transfer its endowments to some College in Ulster, because it must be remembered that the Catholics in Ulster were absolutely without any endowment for educational purposes whatever. There were many ways of settling this question, and, as his hon. Friend had said, it would only perhaps be inviting criticism to go into the details. He submitted that the case which his hon. Friend had brought forward, and which he had tried to support, could not in justice be refused, and he hoped it would commend itself both to the favourable consideration of the Government and the country.

MR. LEWIS said, he thought the Committee had reason to congratulate themselves on the absence from the speech of the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel Colthurst) of the kind of remarks which had sometimes entered into the debates on this subject. He (Mr. Lewis) felt also that they might congratulate themselves that the demands put forward in so moderate a tone were of a more modified character than they were accustomed to. There was one fact which, after all, stood in the way of the argument of hon. Members opposite. To what extent would they have an exclusively Catholic College education, as in the case of University College, Dublin—to what extent did the Roman Catholics of Ireland make use of that College? He believed he was right in saying that for the year 1884 only 100 students from the whole of Ireland could be got to place themselves on the roll of that College, built and carried on after their own model, and in their own fashion. It was said that this College was unendowed; but if he understood the principle on which the Legislature had acted, it was that with regard to Colleges which were of a sectarian character no direct endowments had been given. They were aware that complaints had been made with regard to the Queen's Colleges. All those complaints had been made, however, in reference to Queen's College at Galway; but that was an exceptional case, and if they took the cases of Belfast and Cork, they would find the Colleges there had been eminently successful, and had been much appreciated by the people of Ireland. It was true that the Queen's College, Belfast, was, from necessity, largely Presbyterian; but that was due solely to local causes, and not to the constitution of the College. If they took the endowments in comparison to the number of students under instruction, they would find that for each student in Belfast College, the State paid £19 a-year only; whereas, in the case of the Catholic University, the endowment was £5,600 for 104 students, which was at the rate of £56 a-year for each student; in other words, three times as much as the endowment in the former case. It was quite true that during the last two years there had been a decline in the number of students; but if they took the period antecedent to that, they would find there had been a very great increase. A great point had been made by the other side of the House as to the relative honours that were taken by the respective Colleges. It was quite clear, from the figures, that the record of the University College was a distinguished one; but that did not justify the claim for a larger endowment being allowed to the Catholic Colleges. All that it seemed to him to be necessary was that they should take care that the endowments were distributed with an even hand. He only hoped that to-night they would find that his right hon. Friend the Leader of the House (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), whose services in connection with education in Ireland everyone would recognize, was true now to his old principles of mixed education, and would not interfere with the present arrangement in order to appease hon. Members opposite. He would point out that the Catholic College, with all Ireland to appeal to, and with all their advantages, had only 104 students, and it did not appear to him to be a sufficient basis to make this additional demand.

MR. SEXTON: Where does the hon. Member get his figures from?

MR. LEWIS said, they were in the Report presented to that House; if the hon. Gentleman disputed them—[MR. SEXTON: I do]—perhaps he would explain his reasons for doing so?

MR. SEXTON said, the hon. Gentleman had warned the Government against the appeasement of hon. Members sitting on those Benches; but he contended that they were presenting a national claim, and they were hopeful that that claim would be considered, not in any spirit of unnecessary or unreasonable concession, but solely upon its merits. He confessed he was glad that they came to the consideration of the question in the presence of the right hon. Baronet the Leader of the Government in that House (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), because the right hon. Gentleman had paid great personal attention to the question of higher education in Ireland, and because he (Mr. Sexton) knew that he had been personally interested in the passing of two Acts, with the object of lessening the disadvantages under which Roman Catholics suffered. Under the Intermediate Education Act, the Protestant schools were allowed to retain their large endowments; and when the hon. Gentleman talked with regard to the numbers of students and their cost, he (Mr. Sexton) wondered that he had not gone into the question of intermediate education, where, in some cases, the pupils cost the country £75 a-year. But the Intermediate Education Act had done one thing to enable them, the Irish Roman Catholics, to prove their taste and ability for higher education. Under the most discouraging system Catholic boys had come forward in their hundreds and their thousands. It was perfectly clear that the Catholic Body contained within it students in such numbers as would supply, under favourable conditions, a number of students for the University proportionate to the numbers which the Catholics bore to the whole population. Two-thirds of the honours achieved by the students had been obtained by Catholic boys. They had reason to be grateful to the Government for passing the Royal University Act, which enabled them to prove that the Catholic Schools and Colleges in Ireland which devoted themselves to University education were most competent, and compared, not only favourably, but marvellously with the Protestant non-sectarian Colleges. The comparison was so conclusive upon the most cursory examination, that it was not worth arguing. The £5,000 a-year which was applied to the expense of the Queen's University, instead of being applied to the Royal University, was removed from the Estimates, and as the money applied to the Royal University was Irish money, the result was the saving of this £5,000 a-year to the Imperial Treasury. Similarly, by the establishment of the pension system for the National teachers out of Irish money, the Imperial Treasury was saved from £7,000 to £10,000 a-year. He never heard in his life a more misleading, a more fantastic and absurd comparison than the hon. Member for Derry made just now between the Belfast College and the University College; for they found that, while the Dublin University took 90 distinctions last year, the Magee College in Derry took one. That ought to be sufficient; and when they found that state of things to exist, then, he thought Magee College might be put out of consideration altogether. The number of students in Belfast College was not, from the present point of view, any final test of its utility. The test of utility was the passes and distinctions gained by the students in the examinations of the Royal University, which was the machinery placed in Ireland by the Government to discover the competency of a College and the extent to which the students profited by the teaching. He declined to accept the figures, 480, as at all a test, or an efficient test, to prove the efficiency of the Belfast College. With regard to the cost of these Colleges, he would read a few extracts from a private memorandum prepared on the subject—

"The Queen's Colleges have had, since 1851, buildings provided and maintained by the State, a sum of £21,000 a-year, charged on the Consolidated Fund, and a yearly Parliamentary grant amounting, in the year ending March, 1884, to £14,728, exclusive of building charges amounting to £2,726, and pension allowances amounting to £3,525. If from the total sum of £41,979, thus paid from the Treasury on behalf of the Queen's Colleges, there be deducted £9,350, the amount of students' fees paid into the Exchequer, there remains a sum of £32,629, expended in the year 1883-4 on the three Queen's Colleges. Adding £5,000 a-year to represent the interest on the capital sum expended in buildings and appliances, you find that the yearly cost to the nation of the Queen's Colleges is nearly £38,000, or more than £12,500 each. University College, on the other hand, has no direct help from the public funds in any form; but the Senate of the Royal University requires that 14 of its Fellows should, in addition to their primary duty of acting as University Examiners, give their services in teaching at University College. This may be looked upon as an indirect endowment, equivalent, at the utmost, to £3,000 a-year, but given in an inconvenient form. Beyond this aid University College has no endowment of any kind—no provision for buildings, or expenses, or maintenance of working staff."

It was only fair, he contended, to charge University College with the proportion of the time of these Fellows which they occupied in teaching at the University College, and not that that they occupied in examination at the Royal University. Therefore, those who were best able to judge put the benefit down at £200 a-year each, instead of £400. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Derry had said that there were only 104 students at the University College. There were only 104 matriculated students, it was true; but there were 116 students who had not yet matriculated, making a total of 220 students altogether, and on that basis, instead of the figures given by the hon. Member, the cost of students at the respective Colleges was £27 at the Belfast College, and £28 at the University College. How did they provide for the endowment of Protestant University education in Ireland? The Royal University, which was a purely Protestant University, had an income of £60,000 a-year, not voted by the House, but provided from public sources. Now, they claimed a voice in the disposal of those resources; and they held that the Catholics of Ireland were entitled to their fair proportion not only of the money provided by Parliament for educational purposes, but of the money left from time to time from public sources for every branch of education—Primary, Intermediate, and University. He contended also that they were entitled to their fair share of such funds in proportion to the population, as against any other sect in Ireland. Trinity College, for the benefit mainly of Protestant students, was receiving £110,000 a-year; add to that sum the £38,000 received by the Queen's Colleges, and the £20,000 given to the Royal University, and they had a total sum of £168,000 a-year devoted by the State, or by the sanction of the State, to University education, and of that sum the Catholics received £3,000 a-year. Yet out of the 5,000,000 of people in Ireland 4,000,000 were Catholics. That was to say, that the Catholics received about 3*d.* in the pound of the total grant made to Ireland, notwithstanding that, as he had already pointed out, they had taken about two-thirds of the prizes. If he were pressed for an opinion to-night, he would say that the whole of this amount would have to be put into a common fund, and that about three-fourths of it would have to be applied to Catholic education. [*Laughter.*] The hon. Member for Derry might smile; but the Irish Members always had to bring forward tremenduous moral grievances in order to get justice. What did the intermediate examinations prove? Would the Committee listen for a moment to the result of the examination for distinctions last October? Well, in that examination 80 passed from the Catholic College, and that from an institution carried on through an ordeal of exceptional severity. It had maintained itself for 13 years on public subscriptions, and at considerable loss to the Jesuit Fathers. What would become of the boast that the Royal University met the case of the Catholics if the Jesuit Fathers threw up the work to-morrow, and said they could no longer go on doing it at a loss? There would only be a handful of students go up in the future. Well, the University College passed 80 students; but what was the case with the Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway? Cork had only passed 28, and Galway 30. So that between them these two Colleges had only passed 58 students, as against 80 by the University College. Cork and Galway cost £25,000 a-year between them; and if they divided 58 students into £25,000, they had the fact that the Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway were passing students at a cost of £500 each student. At the examination in October, 1884, the total number of students who passed from University College was 80; Queen's College, Cork, 28; Queen's College, Galway, 30. In classics the Queen's Colleges at Cork and Galway took not a single honour. It was a remarkable thing that the record of those institutions, whose endowments were so costly to the State, should be, in respect of classical honours, a perfect blank. The case of University College was very different, for of the 80 students who passed 21 obtained distinction in classics. Then, with regard to modern languages, the analysis of the results list stood thus — Cork Queen's College, 6; Galway Queen's College, 6; and University College, 33. Again, in scientific subjects, although Cork Queen's College and Galway Queen's College had provided for them by Government splendid buildings, libraries, museums, and laboratories, fitted up with all appliances without regard to cost, and although University College had no similar provision, actually the number of distinctions in scientific subjects had been for the Catholic University College 19, as against 6 for Queen's College, Galway, and 12 for Queen's College, Cork, or more than the total distinctions gained by the two latter Colleges together. This was a most remarkable fact. They made no attack on Queen's College, Belfast. It was in the midst of a Presbyterian population; it had an admirable body of Professors; it was practically a Presbyterian College; it was well attended, and had achieved most creditable results. They did not say one word against an institution which was a very useful one. At this point, he would ask the attention of the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite to a statement made by an eminent scholar, Professor Peabody, of the Magee College. Professor Peabody, in drawing attention to the fact that at Queen's College, Cork, 30 scholarships were available for distribution amongst 36 students, said that they must look at this matter without prejudice, and asked if the authorities of the Colleges in the South and West could be blamed for regarding such scholarships, not as rewards for learning, but simply as bribes to Catholic students to disregard the teachings of their Church and enrol themselves under the banner of Protestantism? He went on to say that the most enlightened Protestants had ceased to approve the policy of enforcing religious teaching by the offer of temporal prizes to supposed converts, and that the wisdom of paying young men for attending the Queen's College lectures would be questioned. That was the testimony of an eminent scholar; it could not be put aside; and he spoke simply as an educationalist when he called attention to what was, in its moral aspect, a scandal, and in its educational aspect an intolerable grievance. Now, with regard to the general summary of results, Queen's College, Belfast, obtained 105 distinctions and prizes at the examination of last October, and University College obtained 90, with, of course, a much smaller number of students. But where were the Queen's Colleges of Galway and Cork? Queen's College, Cork, obtained a total of 20 distinctions, and Queen's College, Galway, obtained 8. With all their special advantages, with the payment of their expenses by the State, they had obtained between them 28 honours and prizes, as against 90 obtained by the practically unendowed University College, Dublin. That unrecognized and unendowed College had gained at the last examination three times more honours than the two other Colleges together; and taking the Cork Queen's College and the Galway Queen's College separately, it had gained three times as many honours as the former, and more than 10 times as many as the latter. Now, the claim which Irish Members made was that the College which had so signally distinguished itself should be allowed a chance of living. If the State did not go to its assistance, that College would go down. University College, Dublin, had national obligations, and it met them in a national and courageous spirit. The Government might say that the time was not come when that assistance should be given, and that the question must be considered as a whole. It was, no doubt, true that the whole question was in suspense; but why did the Government go on, year after year, making large and lavish grants to the Queen's Colleges in Galway and Cork, while they denied to University College, Dublin, a chance of existence? They could not say that they were debarred from helping it; because, while the State endowment to the Queen's Colleges amounted to £38,000, or more than £12,500 each, there was an indirect endowment of University College of about £3,000 a-year. Trinity College was, practically, a denominational College, and it received £110,000. In view of these facts, Irish Members considered their present demand an extremely moderate one. They asked no more than half the amounts enjoyed by either of the two Colleges of Cork and Galway, both of which together University College had eclipsed at the last examinations. For his own part, he would be disposed to say that the funds of the Queen's Colleges should be thrown into a common fund. It was necessary not only to aid institutions with a teaching staff and appliances, but also to aid the individual student in his struggles towards educational distinction and a position in the world. The student at the Royal University had but a few prizes open to him; they were small in amount, and were hedged about by many restrictions. For instance, a Scholarship could only be obtained by one in nine. But how different was the case of the Queen's Colleges! The student there passed a nominal matriculation; no real knowledge of Greek or Latin was required of him; he might go up for examination at the Royal University; he might fail to obtain a prize, an honour, or a pass; but he could go back to Cork or Galway, and then, by passing a nominal examination, obtain one of those Scholarships which were strewn about the floors of the Colleges, to be had almost without asking. That meant that wherever a Catholic student could be found in Ireland who would ignore the repeated instructions of his own Prelates, that it was not suitable or safe for a Catholic to go within the sphere of secular education, there was a prize awaiting him. All he had to do was to turn his back upon their instructions, and enter the halls of the University, and then, no matter how stupid he might be, or how contemptible might be his academic acquirements, he was sure of a Scholarship and the means of supporting himself on his road to education. But the Catholic student who obeyed the directions of the authorities of his Church, and got his education where it could be had consistently with conscience —he was left to starve. That was the condition of affairs at the present time, and Irish Catholics could not accept it as being just. Although the moment had not come for an elaborate examination of the Irish University Question, or for the full apportionment of the funds available for University purposes, and for the due consideration of the claims of the Irish people, he (Mr. Sexton) said that this moment was proper for the consideration of the special claim they made that night. If the Government neglected the reasonable claim of University College, Dublin, if that College went down, they might, before long, have to regret the result which might be brought about by their refusal to extend to it a helping hand.

MR. SYNAN said, he should not again describe the various attempts which had been made by different Goverments, Conservative as well as Liberal, to settle this question. The statement of the hon. Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) having been followed and amplified by the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), he should confine himself to the narrow issue that had been raised. It seemed to him that this debate had arisen in Committee under extraordinary circumstances. The whole of the Liberal Party was absent, and the whole of the Conservative Party, with the exception of one or two leading Members of the Government, were absent also. It was under those circumstances that, as he understood, his hon. Friend proposed to draw from the Chancellor of the Exchequer his view as to the future of University education in Ireland, and his view as to the great inequality with which the Catholic University College in Dublin was at the present moment treated. If he (Mr. Synan) were to enter on the various aspects of the question of Irish University education, and if he were to repeat to the Committee the various attempts that had been made to settle it, he supposed he should delay them a much longer time than they or he would wish; and as that delay would be objectless he did not mean to weary the Committee by going over the subject again. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer would know that the difficulty they had over the Irish University Question was as to whether it should be settled on denominational grounds or upon mixed educational and secular grounds. The hon. Member for Sligo had called the Dublin University a denominational University. It was so; but if his hon. Friend had been in the House of Commons in the year 1872, he would have known that an Act of Parliament was carried for the purpose of making it a secular University, and thereby gratify the Secular Party in England. Trinity College was a distinct College; its students went to the chapel of the College; it was, for all purposes, a denominational College; and yet, by means of the Act of 1872, it had escaped from the fangs of the Secular Party in England. Then there was the case of the Queen's College, Belfast. The hon. Member for Derry (Mr. Lewis) had treated Irish Members as if they were attacking Belfast College; but they made no attack upon it whatever. But Belfast College was not a secular College; it was practically denominational; it was a distinct school; it educated people for the Presbyterian Church. It was in every sense denominational, and was entitled on that ground alone to retain the funds which it got from the State. The hon. Member for Derry said that Belfast College only received £9,000 a-year from the State; but with the £21,000 charged on the Consolidated Fund the yearly Parliamentary grant of £14,000, building charges £2,700, and pensions and allowances £3,525, the annual payment on account of the Queen's Colleges was about £41,900; and if from that was deducted the £9,350 paid into the Exchequer for students' fees, there remained £32,600, or thereabouts. Well, Belfast College received one-third of that; and if in the calculation of the hon. Member that amounted to £9,000, all he (Mr. Synan) could say was that they had learnt arithmetic in different schools. The issue before the Committee seemed to be as to whether or not University College, Dublin, was to get a grant of £6,000 a-year. The hon. Member for Derry said that University College received £5,600. But here, again, he (Mr. Synan) differed from the hon. Gentleman. One would say, at all events, that the expenses of the 12 Professors ought to be divided between the Royal University and University College; and if it were so divided the latter received the enormous sum of £2,800, and that the hon. Gentleman made out to be £5,600 a-year. And then the hon. Gentleman said that University College, Dublin, had only 104 students; but he (Mr. Synan) preferred on that point to take the uncontradicted statement of his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton). If this £6,000 was given to University College, it would only make up the amount received from the State to £8,800, while Galway College was getting £12,000 a-year. And yet Galway College had only 103 students. Now, it appeared to him that, with all these facts and figures before them, Her Majesty's Government ought to be able to make up their minds at once what to do in this matter. But there was another and a larger matter in connection with this subject which they had brought before the House in 1883, and that was the amount given to the Queen's Colleges for prizes. These three Colleges received every year for prizes £4,800, while the three unendowed Colleges got nothing. Let a few thousands be taken out of the £20,000 given to the Royal University and given to those Colleges which got nothing, which had only a few prizes, and were obliged to share them with the students of the Queen's Colleges. The prizes were open to the students of the Queen's Colleges, as well as to the students of the unendowed denominational Colleges. Would the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer say that that was a fair system? He (Mr. Synan) admitted that a student of one of the Queen's Colleges could not enjoy both prizes; but he could go down to the Royal University and contend for a prize, and perhaps get it; or, if he failed to get it, he could go to his own College and get a cheap prize there. What was the language of the learned Professor, quoted by his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo, upon that system? Why, he said that if a student of one of the Queen's Colleges won a prize at the Royal University it was given to him; but if he did not, he had only to return to his own College, and he would there find a prize preserved for him, a consolation prize, more valuable than that which he had been unable to obtain at the Royal University. And what was the result of this? According to the Report of the Royal Commission, the unendowed Colleges had beaten the Queen's Colleges. He asked why should this system be allowed to continue? If the Queen's Colleges were deprived of the amount given for prizes, and if it were attached to the Royal University, would it not be a fair, wise, and equal system, and should not the Queen's Colleges be content with being upon equal terms with the others? He admitted that Belfast College was denominational, that it fairly represented the Presbyterian population of Ulster, who were 40 per cent of the entire population, the Catholics being in the proportion of 50 per cent or 60 per cent. But the Catholic people of Ulster, on account of their principles, would not send their children as students to Belfast College, and accordingly there was only 4 per cent of Catholics among the students. What were the number of Presbyterian students in Galway? 45; and where did they come from? From Ulster. Having failed to win prizes in Belfast, they went to Galway, where they won cheap prizes. No one would attempt to say that these Presbyterian students were in fair proportion of the total number. The Presbyterian population of Connaught was not 1 per cent, while the Catholic population was 95 per cent, and yet the Presbyterian students in Galway College were 85 per cent, and the Catholic students only 44 per cent. The Catholic population of Munster was 90 per cent of the whole, and yet there were only from 180 to 200 Catholic students in Cork College. But that was a broad question which he would like the Government to enter upon hereafter. He wished to pin the right hon. Gentleman now to this sum of £6,000 a-year to the Catholic University, to which, in all conscience, she was entitled. He admitted there were other unendowed Colleges under the Royal University; but they asked for nothing. He supposed they considered a waiting game the best, and remained silent. But the Catholic University wanted this £6,000 to make the Colleges more efficient, and he hoped the Government would give it. It would only, at all events, bring them within a very remote distance of the endowments of other Colleges. If the Government decided to give this money, it might have the effect of reconciling Catholic opinion within a certain limit. It might have the effect, perhaps, of earning some thanks for Her Majesty's Government for doing an act of justice, although it would not, he admitted, have the effect of settling this University Question, which, sooner or later, would have to be settled on a broad and efficient basis. It was impossible that they could leave the matter where it was. He knew that under the advice—the threat almost—of the hon. Member for Derry they were going to attempt to reconcile the Catholics in Ireland to their administration by telling them they would not get anything more than they enjoyed at present. He could assure them they had a very bad adviser in the hon. Gentleman the Member for Derry if they followed him so far. If he (Mr. Synan) appealed to them on principle, their principles were, he knew, denominational, if they could only carry them out. The Education Question in Ireland must be settled, and settled according to the opinion of the Irish people; therefore, he rested satisfied with these observations, and the debate which had preceded his short observations. He awaited with impatience the answer of the Government in the person of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which he trusted would be a favourable answer.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH): I should have much preferred to have left this subject in the hands of my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant (Sir William Hart Dyke), who, I am sure, is very well qualified to deal with it; but I must own that I have always felt, and still feel, a very deep interest in the matter. Hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House have referred to my action with regard to Irish education in so kind a spirit that I think I ought to make some observations on the subject. I would wish to say, in the first place, that this is not a question which ought to be approached with the idea of concession or conciliation. I should wish to approach it—and I think we all would wish to approach it—with the sole desire of endeavouring to spread as far as possible what I believe to be the great blessings of University education in Ireland among all persons, whatever their creed, and, so far as possible, whatever their class, if duly qualified to receive it. That is the spirit in which I have always endeavoured to regard this question. That is the spirit in which the Intermediate Education Act of 1878 was framed—an Act which I think is admitted by all, whether the friends of mixed education or of denominational education, to have had a singular success, and to have conferred the greatest benefits upon the Irish people. That also was the spirit in which the University Education Act of 1879 was framed. What was the principal difficulty which we had then to meet? We were face to face with this fact—that, although it was possible for those persons in Ireland whose religious scruples forbade them taking advantage of the Queen's Colleges, or the education offered them in Trinity College, Dublin, to obtain University degrees by graduating in the London University, yet it was not possible for them to obtain such degrees in their own country. Therefore, in 1879, the Government of the day, of which I was a Member, introduced and carried a Bill by which we merged the Queen's University, which up to that time had consisted, as the Committee are aware, of the Colleges of Cork, Belfast, and Galway, in a Royal University, which was enabled by the Act of 1879 to confer degrees upon all comers qualified to receive them, and was also endowed with a considerable sum to be devoted to the purpose of establishing Exhibitions, Scholarships, Fellowships, and other prizes for proficiency in subjects of secular education, and not in respect of any subject of religious instruction. In passing that Act I think there was one matter which very much weighed with us; that was this—that the sum devoted in Ireland to the purposes of University education was by no means a large one. The sum contributed either by the State or from the Church Surplus Fund, under the Act of 1879, to University education certainly cannot be called large. The endowments provided for the purpose, even if you take into consideration the endowments of Trinity College, Dublin, are certainly by no means too large for this great and extensive work. We were anxious in what we did not to destroy, but to maintain and utilize everything we found that aided in giving University education, and to extend the system in order to remove the particular grievance to which I have alluded. Well, now, we found the Queen's Colleges in existence as parts of the Queen's University. While I was Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, it fell to my lot to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the condition of those Colleges, mainly, I think, with reference to the system of instruction pursued in them and the emoluments of the Professors. On that Commission I appointed Mr. Osborne Gordon, whose name will, I think, long be remembered in Oxford University, and also in connection with the Civil Service examinations, as that of a man of remarkable attainments and knowledge of University education generally. He was aided in this work by two other gentlemen—Professor Allman and Mr. Herbert Murray—who were well qualified to act with him. Their Report spoke highly of the work done in the Queen's Colleges. Now, that was an authority which was to my mind of a very important character. We believed the Queen's Colleges were doing a really good work in Ireland, and we endeavoured to sustain and to increase that work by passing the University Act, 1879; but now we have to look upon the subject by the light of five years' experience of that Act. In one point I am afraid it has done some harm to the Queen's Colleges. I understand that the fact that students can obtain degrees without being members of those Colleges has deprived the Professors of those Colleges of a very considerable amount of the attendance at their lectures which they formerly enjoyed, and that, therefore, their emoluments have been diminished. No doubt, that cannot tend to the efficiency of the Queen's Colleges themselves, besides being a very great hardship to the existing Professors, who have done their work well. But another point appears to have come to light, and I confess it seems to me to be one of great importance. In considering the Act of 1879, I was very much influenced by the relationship which the University examinations in the old Queen's University system bore to the Queen's Colleges. Those examinations were conducted by the Professors of the Queen's Colleges themselves, and I confess I was a little suspicious of their standard. It did occur to me that it might be possible that in a University so very close, so to speak, as the Queen's University was, the standard of a University degree might have been lowered, and that, in fact, the University would be a better instrument of education in Ireland if it were extended to other students, and included other examiners than those connected with the Queen's Colleges. Now, if I am correctly informed—and I have listened attentively to what has been said this evening—my suspicions were not altogether ill-founded. It is remarkable that a College not directly endowed with any public money, indirectly only receiving so small an amount as the Catholic University of Dublin receives, having to provide all its buildings and apparatus, still should, in a fair competition in University education with the students of the Queen's Colleges, show such surprising results as have been stated to-night. The statement which has been made appeared to me almost to require some explanation;

because I cannot understand how an institution which, according to the Parliamentary Returns that have been quoted, only possesses 104 students, should be able to secure so large a proportion of University degrees and honours as has been obtained by the students of the Catholic University College. It does seem to me as that the Catholic University College, being in the position I have described, has done better in these examinations than the Queen's Colleges which it meets in competition. Of course, I am not referring to Belfast College, which undoubtedly has held its own; but I refer to the Colleges of Cork and Galway. This, to my mind, raises a very important and serious question, which I think even the hon. Gentleman the Member for Derry (Mr. Lewis), or anyone who approaches the question of University education from his point of view, must admit deserves every consideration. Is it, or is it not, the fact that the money this House votes for the purposes of University education in Ireland is applied in the best manner possible at present? Now, I am bound to say that I find a difficulty in giving an answer to that question. I think it is one that requires the very serious and early attention of Her Majesty's Government; indeed, it seems to have, to some extent, received the attention of our Predecessors. In looking at the debate of last year I noticed that the Secretary to the Treasury, then the hon. Gentleman the Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), laid great stress upon the Commission which had been appointed by the Government in 1884 to inquire into various points connected with the Colleges. He quoted the References to this Commission. He said one of them was—

> "1. What is the standard of education maintained at the Queen's Colleges, or any of them?"

That, obviously, bears very much on the point I have alluded to. The other References were—

> "2. In what mode the honours and rewards are distributed in the three Colleges respectively, having regard to the numbers of the students, and the various branches of learning taught? 3. To what extent, and with what results, do the students avail themselves of the advantages offered by the Royal University? 4. The question of the affiliation of these Colleges with the Royal University. Is there any active and strong connection with the University? Do any large number of students go from the Colleges to the University; and what are the fees charged to the students?"

A statement has been made—I think by the hon. Member who last spoke (Mr. Synan)—to the effect that students of the Queen's Colleges, having failed in University competitions for prizes given under the Act of 1879, have actually been enabled to fall back on prizes of greater value in their own Colleges. I am bound to say that that does not seem to me a very satisfactory state of things. The Commission I have referred to was issued in the spring of 1884, and the hon. Member for Liskeard, in alluding to it, stated that the Report would not be ready until the end of September or October last. He further said that when it was presented it would be the serious duty of the Irish Government to consider the Report in relation to the whole question. He promised, in fact, that the late Government would deal with the matter by the light of that Report. Why have they not done so? I take it, for the obvious reason—although I have not been able, owing to the multitudinous duties of my Office, to study the Report—that the Commissioners were so seriously divided amongst themselves, that it could not be said they had made any Report at all; and, therefore, nothing was proposed beyond the renewal of the old Vote for the Queen's Colleges. Now, I do not at all wish to express a definite opinion on this question. Indeed, I have not had time to study it; and I should be sorry to express a definite opinion on behalf of any of my Colleagues. But this, I think, I may venture to say—that we do not feel that the present position of it is satisfactory, and that we feel this to such an extent that it would be quite impossible for us to comply with the request of the hon. Member for Limerick and other hon. Members, and try to deal with it by giving a Vote of £6,000 for a particular purpose. We could not do that. We think that a full examination of the whole question is necessary, in order to see whether we cannot settle it on a proper basis. The hon. Member for Londonderry has expressed the hope that we will not depart from the old lines on which the whole question has been dealt with. But what are they? The lines on which it has been dealt with successfully are those of the Intermediate Education Act of 1878, and of the measure of 1879, whereby it was decided that the State should pay for the results of secular education wherever given and however obtained, quite irrespective of the circumstance whether they were gained by private tuition, in a denominational College, or in a mixed College. Now, those are the principles the Government ought to maintain. After the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church of Ireland, surely no one will for a moment propose that the State should pay for religious education in Ireland. What it can do for secular education it ought to do. Speaking here, as I have always done, as a believer in religious education, I will say that I do not think it is right in these days, when irreligion rather than the predominance of any particular form of religion is the thing we have to dread, that the State should endeavour to discourage religious education. This, Sir, is all that I have to say to the Committee to-night. We shall continue to regard this question on the principle I have laid down, with the hope and the wish to do something to make University education more general and widespread in Ireland; and if it should be our lot to hold Office next Session, to make some proposal which may deal in a satisfactory way with this most important matter.

Mr. DAWSON said, he had listened with great satisfaction to the statement of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was his (Mr. Dawson's) privilege to know something of the rule of the right hon. Gentleman in Ireland when he was Chief Secretary. He remembered that an impression had been fast gaining ground in the Corporation, of which he (Mr. Dawson) had been a member, that the right hon. Baronet was about the first Chief Secretary who had thrown off the shackles and was acting for himself and according to his own instincts and belief. But since he had listened to the right hon. Baronet's remarks that evening, he recognized, with still more hope and confidence, the ability with which he had discussed this question, and the sense of fairness and justice which had pervaded his observations. He (Mr. Dawson) was, furthermore, emboldened to believe that the subject of doing justice to the educational claims of Ireland was recognized from the fact that another Member of the Government, a noble Lord, having himself, on a Commission over which he presided, became practically acquainted with the inequality and injustice of the endowments for education in that country. Therefore it was that on all these grounds they approached this subject under the present Administration. They approached it with more confidence still, because when the right hon. Gentleman holding the position of Chancellor of the Exchequer—a right hon. Gentleman holding the purse-strings in his hand—declared the sum which was pleaded for to be miserably small, the only conclusion they could arrive at was that he was prepared to do what was liberal and just in the cause of Irish education. The right hon. Gentleman had heard with astonishment the figures which had been put before him in regard to University College, whose specific and peculiar claims the Irish Members were putting forward. He (Mr. Dawson) was informed that the figures quoted, startling as they were, still were perfectly true. There were only about 100 matriculated students on the books of the University, and 80 from University College passed with honours in the Royal University examination. On the subject of numbers, he might say, in passing, that the hon. Member for Derry (Mr. Lewis) had referred to the three Queen's Colleges and their endowments—to Galway and its 400 students; but that was not the Catholic University for which hon. Members were pleading. They were pleading the cause of a University of one years' existence; and they said that if it had 100 students so distinguished in one year, if they were to multiply its opportunities of usefulness, what would it not do in 30 years, which had been the period of the career of the Belfast College? But there was another reason why University College should be supported. On what did the Royal University depend? It could not depend on Galway College or on Cork College, because they had given it no aid whatever. They had shown no ability, and had won no prizes, nor had they given the Examining Board the shadow of a claim to the University. What foundation was there for the University? It was by University College that it had been known up to this—it was by the distinction and success of this struggling University College that this beau-ideal of the right hon. Gentleman had any existence at all. If for nothing but the sustainment of the Royal University, with which the right hon. Gentleman was so much identified, the right hon. Gentleman ought not to put off this *ad interim* appeal the Irish Members were making on behalf of this University College. It was impossible to settle the whole question that Session; but if they let this College drop, the University would drop for want of students; therefore he (Mr. Dawson) hoped the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider the matter, as he had had the courage in Ireland to reconsider points which were brought before him. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Derry had referred to the number of students in the Belfast and Galway Colleges which, as the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had shown, had run down with such rapidity in the honour list. Well, in these Queen's Colleges the cost to the State for the students who took honours at the University was £500 a-piece. In the University College the cost was £40 a-piece. But they did not think, nor did the promoters of this scheme believe, that in giving this *ad interim* sustainment of a few thousands of pounds a-year the University Question in Ireland would be settled. He believed his hon. Friend the Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy) had left some gaps in his history of University education in Ireland; and he (Mr. Dawson) would call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to what his own Government had proposed in the scheme of Lord Mayo, which was, perhaps, the only intelligible scheme ever proposed for the settlement of the question of University education in Ireland. He would not say what had made Lord Mayo's scheme decline—whether it was the hesitation of the Catholic Bishops to accept it, or the precipitancy with which the Government took it up. There was Trinity College with its endowments, arising from land and other sources, amounting to £110,000 a-year; and Mr. Butt's proposal was to establish a Catholic College which should be a College of the University of Dublin, to call it St. Patrick's College, and to give it a separate endowment. The only argument used against that solution of the University Question was that the students of St. Patrick's College would turn in in such numbers that they would soon swamp the University. He was astonished to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer talk about one examination and one central authority. There was nothing more fatal to literature and learning than one State machine, which moulded into one mould the genius and learning of the country. Take the example of Germany and France. Germany, which had succeeded in every *rôle* it had played for the last 20 years, had 37 Universities; but in France there was but one huge State machine, and the result was most disastrous to the learning of the country. In Scotland there were four or five Universities, and in England there were many Universities. It was in Ireland alone that an attempt was to be made to diminish the number of Universities, and to approve a State machine like the Examining Board of the Royal University. The Irish people were not prepared to lose the traditions of University history; they were not prepared to give up their great scheme of a Catholic University for Catholic students; but they did fear that this long postponement of justice would be fatal to higher education in their country. They wanted the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer to sustain this distinguished University College as a means of preserving the traditions of University life amongst Catholics. If this University College was shut up, the idea of a University and an academical life would be entirely removed from Ireland. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer would display on this question what he had displayed in former times on Irish questions—namely, his own independence of character, and that he would give the small sum asked by this University College. University College in Dublin was supported, as had been said, by an Order who were themselves losing £2,000 a-year out of their own funds in trying to hold their own in this unequal struggle. Could they continue to do that? If they could not the doors of the College would be shut, and the distinguished students of the Royal University would cease to exist. He hardly thought the right hon. Genlteman appreciated the urgency of this question. The University Question might be dropped for a later period; but the existence of this College was a matter of the moment. He was sure the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill), who had taken great interest in the education question in Ireland, who had himself pointed out the inequality of the endowments, would support the appeal now made to the Chancellor of the Exchequer not to put off any longer the settlement of this subject, because delay would be fatal to a College whose distinctions the right hon. Gentleman had confessed, and whose inadequate resources he had remarked upon.

Mr. P. J. POWER said, that hon. Members who sat near him had listened to some of the observations which fell from the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer with satisfaction. At the same time, they heard the latter part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech with some feelings of regret. It had been pointed out by Irish Members that this was a matter of life or death as far as one struggling College was concerned, and they thought they had very good grounds for making this claim on the Government. The broad issues of the case must be borne in mind in coming to a conclusion on a matter of this kind. Broadly speaking, the Catholics of Ireland numbered about four-fifths of the entire population; and though vast sums of money were spent on education — primary, intermediate, and higher—it must surprise hon. Members to hear that four-fifths of the people of Ireland received only about one-fortieth of the sum granted to the Universities. In fact, if they were to reckon the interest on the money invested in buildings, museums, and so forth, it would be found that the figure he had quoted was, if anything, under the mark, and that the Catholics of Ireland did not receive more than one-sixtieth part of the sum granted by the English Government to University education in Ireland. It was said the Catholics received a certain amount of endowment in connection with this University College; but if the matter were investigated, it would be found that the sum, paltry as it was, was given in the most inconvenient way in which it could be given, and that placing certain Fellows at the service of the University College was not, in some respects, a wise way of indirectly endowing the College. Then, again, other Colleges had this advantage on their side—the Queen's Colleges, for instance—that, besides very large endowments for educational purposes, they had a grant of £1,500 a-year to be distributed in honours and prizes to students who availed themselves of the services of those Colleges; whereas the University College had none of these inducements. But much as the Catholics of Ireland had to contend against in these matters —bearing in mind the way in which the Catholics of Ireland were handicapped —it must be conceded that the results, as tested by the Royal University, exceeded the most sanguine expectation of even Catholics themselves. It would be seen by the figures quoted by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) that the University College had obtained more distinctions in classics and in modern languages than three Queen's Colleges put together had obtained. These facts in themselves spoke something for the efficiency of the University College for which this claim was made. No Member of the Irish Party had contended that the Queen's College in Belfast was a failure. That College was, undoubtedly, a success; but the reason of its success was worthy of notice; it was a success because it met the views of the people amongst whom it was situated, and was in accord with the opinions of a majority, or of a very considerable portion, at least, of the people of Ulster. The conditions of the Queen's Colleges at Cork and Galway were due to the fact that the Colleges were at complete variance with the majority of the people of the Provinces in which they were situated. It was all very well for the Government to say that they were offering the Irish Catholics a system of education, and that it was their own fault if they refused to avail themselves of it. The Catholics of Ireland ought to be the best judges on the matter, and it made very little difference to them whether the Government offered them no University system, or offered them a system of University training which they honestly believed they could not avail themselves of. On that point it would be well to bear in mind that the Catholics of Ireland disapproved so much of the system that was placed at their disposal that, in the course of the last 30 years, they had subscribed about £250,000 to provide themselves with University education. It might be a very expensive operation; but, at the same time, they might gather from the fact what the views of the Catholics were on the subject, and what great sacrifices they were prepared to make in order to obtain for their children a proper system of education. They asked no more than fair play in the matter, and he thought that the results attending the Intermediate Education Act, with which the name of the right hon. Gentleman was so honourably connected, were enough to show that if the Government supplied them with a proper system of higher education large numbers would be found ready to avail themselves of it. Handicapped as the Catholics of Ireland were in intermediate educational matters, it was gratifying to know that they had been able to obtain 60 per cent of the exhibitions awarded under the Intermediate Education Act. Though he might thereby transgress somewhat upon the subject under consideration, he would ask the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the way in which the Intermediate Education Board was treating the matter of intermediate education. They were starving the funds, and endeavouring to keep people from availing themselves of the advantages of the system. The prizes were greatly reduced; in many instances the Board had refused to give the prizes earned by the students. He might mention one instance which came under his immediate attention not long since, of a poor boy who studied hard in school, and presented himself for the intermediate examination, under the impression that if he obtained a certain number of marks he would receive a silver medal. He worked day and night; his parents, who were poor, provided him with what books they could; and he did obtain the marks which entitled him to a silver medal. He was informed, however, by the Intermediate Education Board that, though he had obtained the necessary marks to entitle him to a medal, the Government were not in a position to give one to him. The unfortunate lad would have remained without his silver medal had it not been that the Mayor of Waterford put his hand in his pocket and provided what in honour the Intermediate Board were bound to provide. He (Mr. P. J. Power) mentioned this *en passant*, so that the Government might instruct those who were responsible for this state of things to see that such scandals—he could call them nothing else—were not repeated, at any rate, during the Tory *régime*. A great deal had been said as to denominational education in Ireland, and it had been stated that the Government could not approve of such a system. But he maintained that the very fact of Trinity College existing as it did was, to a certain extent, an answer to that argument. It could not be conceded that Trinity College was not worked, to some extent, on denominational lines. The College for which he and his hon. Friends now made a claim for help was open, as far it could be, to people of all political and religious opinions. It was competent for anyone to avail themselves of its services, and still, at the same time, not be actual students of the University College. But Trinity College, which had an enormous grant of about £60,000 a-year, leaving out of the calculation the interest of money sunk in permanent buildings and in museums, and the like, was, to a certain extent, carried out on the very lines to which he understood the Government objected; and, consequently, the objection of the Government to the College for which a claim was now made did not hold good. This was to be considered also in comparing the results—that it was only in those matters where money was needed that the University College was at all inferior or deficient to the Belfast Queen's College. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer that this was a question of the highest importance. The body at present conducting this University College was not in a position to incur any further loss. It had conducted the College at a considerable loss for the last two years, and could not afford to lose anything more by the transaction. If the right hon. Gentleman would accede to what he (Mr. P. J. Power) thought the very modest proposal of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Longford (Mr. Justin M'Carthy), he would be able to make an institution which could be availed of to a considerable extent in the scheme which it was hoped the present Government would be able to bring forward in regard to University education. In conclusion, he might say that, on this as on many other questions, the policy of his hon. Friend the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had been fully justified. It might be in the recollection of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer that, when a measure on this subject was introduced at the fag-end of a Session, that hon. Gentleman opposed it, regarding it as a mere stop-gap Bill, which, in fact, would seriously impede the final settlement of this important matter. The hon. Gentleman was then, as on many other occasions, jeered at. It was said the hon. Gentleman was unwise in his opposition; but events had justified the course he then took. It was quite clear that, if that measure had been left unpassed, a much more satisfactory Bill would have been passed before this. There was no doubt that there were difficulties in the way of the Government dealing now with the broad question of University education. At that period of the Session it was quite impossible for them to bring in a Bill dealing satisfactorily with that, perhaps one of the greatest subjects which could engage the attention of any Government. On this Education Question the English Government owed the people of Ireland a considerable debt; indeed, nothing demonstrated so much their incompetence to deal with Irish subjects as the manner in which the people of Ireland had been treated in regard to education. It was impossible, as he had said, that the Government should be able to make up their minds now to bring forward a really comprehensive measure on the subject; but he certainly thought that a Government which had shown itself so deeply interested in Irish educational matters as the present would be able to grant the request made by the hon. Member for Longford, and endeavour to maintain what was really a very valuable educational institution.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) asked for information on one or two points which he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) thought he could supply. The right hon. Gentleman asked how it was that, with so small a number of students as the University College, the students were able to gain so many honours? The explanation was this—that students going up to the first and second University examinations were allowed to take honours in more than one subject; and, accordingly, one student might take honours in Latin, in classics, and in modern languages. Of course, that did not apply to the M.A. examination, in which a student could only take one honour. It would be seen, therefore, that there might be more honours than students. Then the right hon. Gentleman said the statement was made that students failing to get honours in the Belfast College went down to Cork and Galway. On that subject the right hon. Gentleman could be supplied with all the facts, so as to bring the matter clearly to his mind. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) could speak with regard to the Queen's Colleges, because he was a student for several years at the Queen's College, Galway. Now, what took place? The examination in Belfast for scholarships took place, he believed, in October. In Belfast it was more difficult to get prizes than in Cork or Galway, because there was such a large number of students there in proportion to the number of prizes. The student who failed to get a prize in the October examination in Belfast came down to Galway, where the examinations did not take place until December, and was often able to get a scholarship there. He could speak with a certain amount of feeling on the subject. After he got his B.A. degree he went in for the senior scholarship. He found that he was not merely opposed by his own fellow-students, but by a gentleman who had never studied a single day or hour in the Galway College, but who had come down from Belfast, simply for the purpose of wresting from Galway a prize which really belonged to Galway. Upon the question of University education, he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) thought the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made as satisfactory a reply as anybody could reasonably expect him to make. The right hon. Gentleman went so far as to admit that the Irish Members had made out their case; that the Queen's Colleges did not give the State money's worth; and he went on to say, on behalf of himself and his Colleagues, that after they had inquired into the question, and examined all the facts, they would, if they were in a position, find the means of remedying the grievance. Now, he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) spoke upon this question in a somewhat different spirit to some of his hon. Friends around him. He was for four years in the Queen's College, Galway, and he always wished to speak with the greatest regard and respect of the Professors and other officials of that College. Many of them were his personal friends, and certainly all of them were men of distinction. What he and others did was to find fault not with the men, but with the system which the men were compelled to administer. The right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House made allusion to the disproportion between the number of prizes and the number of students, and he more than implied tha tthe State was not getting its money's worth. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) did not think the right hon. Gentleman had the advantage of hearing a quotation which was made by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) from something Professor Peabody had written. Professor Peabody had said—

> "What shall we say of 30 scholarships in the Queen's College, Cork, available for distribution last session amongst 36 students, and of 36 scholarships in the Queen's College, Galway, available for distribution amongst 45 students?"

Now, there was just one point more, and upon it he would ask for the attention for one moment of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who might have to deal with this question. As a Galway Member, and as a Connaught Member, he did not desire the Queen's College in Galway to be suppressed as a College; but they demanded that its character should be changed. They wanted it to be maintained as a College, and to be incorporated with the University College. He would tell the right hon. Gentleman why; because it was of the highest importance that University education in Ireland should be brought down to the doors and to the homes of the poorer classes of the people. Any treatment of the University Question in Ireland must start on the principle that University education should take the form of local Colleges. To ask the sons of the lower classes to go to Dublin for their University education was as bad as asking them to go to Paris, to London, or to Calcutta. He knew several boys in Galway, sons of very poor parents, who would never have been able to have got University education if they had had to go even 30 miles out of Galway, because their people were too poor to bear the expense. He knew of one case in point, of a boy whose mother was in a very poor state—indeed, he believed she was a laundress, and it was perfectly certain that she could not afford to send him away to obtain a University training. But by the fact that he was not obliged to go away from home, he was able to join the College, and was able, instead of being a mechanic, which in all probability he would have been, he was able to join the honourable and lucrative profession of a medical man. The Town Commissioners of Galway had passed a very strong resolution in favour of the retention of the Queen's College there; but he thought he had already made himself clear upon that point. He contended, however, that they were now in a condition to demand justice for all classes of the Irish people.

Mr. MARUM said, that while fully agreeing with what had fallen from the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), as to the necessity of following the principle of having local Colleges, promised the Committee that he would not travel over a single point which had already been dealt with. He wished to point out, however, that, in addition to the Catholic Colleges which had been mentioned, there were a dozen diocesan Colleges which were deserving of consideration, and which he hoped would not be overlooked. At the same time he did not want these Colleges to stand in the way of an increase of the grant to the University College, Dublin. He happened to know that the Jesuit Fathers were spending a large amount of money now on University education out of their own pockets, simply in the hope that they would eventually obtain the grant.

Mr. GRAY said, that the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) was, in one sense, satisfactory; but in another it was extremely disappointing. The right hon. Gentleman had given them to understand that something must be done in this matter, and that the Catholics of Ireland had a solid ground of complaint; that was satisfactory. It was exactly 19 years since the Conservative Government of the day, through Lord Mayo, recognized that the Catholics of Ireland had a solid ground of complaint, and made an effort to remedy it; but here they were, 19 years afterwards, pleading for that justice so long recognized as due, and so long denied them. The right hon. Gentleman would recognize that none of those who had spoken from the Irish side of the House had been so unreasonable as to ask that he should come down at that time of the Session, having been in Office for only a short time, with a cut-and-dry scheme to settle a great question which had puzzled so many Governments. But it certainly was extraordinary that, recognizing, as he did, so fully the grievance, and in view of the Report of the Queen's College Commission, which had exposed so thoroughly the utter failure of two out of the three Colleges, he yet came down to the House to ask it to pass a large money Vote in support of these institutions, which were confessedly failures, and at the same time brought himself to refuse a grant of temporary assistance to the maintenance of an institution which might prove to be eventually the nucleus of an arrangement of the greatest advantage to the Catholics of Ireland. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether his refusal of this grant arose from any fear of an anti-Popery cry in the North of Ireland, or of England, at the General Election? If that were his fear, he (Mr. Gray) did not think the right hon. Gentleman should be deterred from doing justice by any such apprehension, because those Colleges were already recognized by the State, and enjoyed a small amount of State endowment. It was scarcely reasonable of the right hon. Gentleman to expect that the Irish people would rest satisfied with his assurance that he would consider the question, whilst, at the same time, he asked them to vote money for other institutions which were being kept up with a view of strangling and destroying Catholic higher education in Ireland. If the right hon. Gentleman were acting *bonâ fide*, he (Mr. Gray) would say that he would not ask them to vote the money for the Queen's Colleges until he had an opportunity of considering the other matter; but if he were determined to do nothing whatever now, either as a temporary or as a permanent arrangement, he must only expect that the Irish Party would use such action as was open to them to protest in the most effective manner possible against the present system. The right hon. Gentleman had thrown out something in the nature of a hint of the lines on which he contemplated dealing with the question if it came to his lot to propose a settlement of it. He (Mr. Gray) would ask the right hon. Gentleman to kindly elucidate that portion of his speech a little more. He understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that he contemplated seeking a solution of the Irish University Question on the lines of the Intermediate Education Act; but he (Mr. Gray) would venture to tell the right hon. Gentleman, if he had that in contemplation, the failure of his Government to settle the Irish Education Question would be at least as great as the failure of any of their Predecessors. The Irish people were determined in this matter that they would have absolute equality, no more and no less; and any settlement based upon the lines of the Intermediate Education Act would not create that equality, unless it were accompanied by the complete disendowment of existing institutions, not merely as prize-giving bodies, but as teaching institutions. He, for one, would be sorry to see all the educational endowments for higher teaching bodies taken away, and all the emoluments given for prizes. Most strong objections could be urged against that course; but if Trinity College was to be left with a large endowment as a teaching body, and the Queen's Colleges were to have endowments as teaching bodies, it was simply absurd for the right hon. Gentleman to dream that any settlement could be accepted by the Irish people which would merely throw open prizes to be competed for by the Irish Catholics, if no assistance was to be given them to prepare them to compete for those prizes. The Royal University gave a certain number of prizes already; but their objection was that while Trinity College was endowed for Protestants, and the Queen's Colleges for those who had no particular care about the combination of religion with education, the institution which alone commanded the confidence of the vast majority of the Irish people was left unendowed, and entered into the competition heavily handicapped. He asked the right hon.

Gentleman if he considered that any settlement or scheme based upon such lines as that could be satisfactory; and he would warn him again that if such a scheme, or anything approaching it, were to be propounded next year or the year afterwards, it could only be met by the most determined resistance by the Irish Members of that House. He did not wish to follow the able arguments of hon. Members on those Benches who had spoken on the matter, because for him to attempt to repeat them would be only to weaken their force. It appeared to him, however, that the great Liberal Party had taken no interest in this discussion, and that during part of it all the Liberal Benches above the Gangway had been entirely empty. They ceased to take any interest in the question since they had changed sides in that House. The Front Opposition Benches had been entirely empty, and no Member of the late Government had taken any notice of this debate, nor any interest in the proceedings whatever. They seemed to think that their interest in this matter had gone with their giving up Office. Now, the present Government could exercise their earnest consideration on this matter, and they would win the gratitude of the majority of the Irish people; but if they thought they could deal with it in the patchwork manner of giving a few more prizes, and throwing them open to Catholics, they were very much mistaken. The people of Ireland were now sufficiently organized, and next Session would be sufficiently represented in that House, to insist that they should have absolute and complete equality, either by levelling up or levelling down. He would earnestly recommend to the right hon. Gentleman that, before he committed himself to any scheme, he would recognize that one fact—they would have no half-measure in this matter; they were determined to have absolute equality. He himself was in favour of levelling up; but if levelling up was not possible they should have levelling down. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir William Hart Dyke) would be able to give them some better assurance than the Chancellor of the Exchequer had done.

MR. MELDON said, he regretted that he could not join in the chorus of admiration at the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, who had admitted that the case stated by the Irish Members that evening had been proved, but had held that the State did not get the full results for the amount of money that was given. Then, having made that admission in support of the case for the Irish Members, the right hon. Gentleman declined to go any further, and distinctly refused to do anything at present. Now, he (Mr. Meldon) did not approve of that "Live horse and get grass" policy at all. The Queen's Colleges were a direct blow at the religion of the country that could not be justified, as they had been forced upon the country, against the wishes of the great majority of the people. He wished to put it to the Government that in the interests of education itself it was all-important that some additional help ought to be given to an institution which it was admitted had, from the slenderest resources, conferred the greatest benefit on Ireland. He referred to the institution in Stephen's Green. It had been conferring the greatest benefits on the country for the last 30 years, and for the last few years it had been kept alive upon resources which he thought it was to the disgrace of that House to allow without making some return. What would be their position if this institution had to close because they had not enough funds to carry it on? Something ought to be done to enable it to go on in the same road on which it had been going since 1879. It seemed to him that the present Government had not been able to make up their minds whether they ought to allow them some temporary relief or not. It was all very well to throw all the blame on the late Government; but they must remember that the present Government had come into Office on their own Motion, and it would not do for them to do nothing and throw all the blame on their Predecessors. It was an exceedingly small matter for the Government, who had had ample time to consider it, and the excuse that they had not been in power sufficiently long had no weight in it.

MR. O'KELLY said, he would say to the present Government that even although they might not be able to deal with the general question thoroughly at present, it would be very desirable if they could see their way to the settlement of the question of the Catholic University

College in Dublin. That College had done a great deal of good work; and although working under considerable difficulties, it had, by sacrifices on the part of the people of Ireland, been able to live on to the present day. Now, what they asked was that an *ad interim* grant should be given to the University College, and he did not consider that that was an unreasonable demand, seeing that it had done more educational work than two of the other Colleges—namely, the Queen's Colleges of Cork and Galway. It had done more work of an educational character than two of the Colleges that they were asked that night to vote money to support. He confessed he could not see on what ground the Government could ask them to continue the Vote for the Queen's Colleges when they would do nothing to assist the only Catholic College in Ireland. With regard to the ultimate solution of this question, he was very much in favour of its being based upon the suggestion of the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor). It was far better, in his opinion, that University education in Ireland should be spread as far as possible over the whole country, because if the Colleges were concentrated in two or three of the large towns, the poorer classes, who could not afford to send their sons to distant places of education, would be practically excluded from the benefits they might otherwise receive. In the country where University education had been most satisfactory, he alluded to Germany, the system pursued had been to spread over the entire country a great number of small local Colleges; and even in Russia the same plan was being adopted, so that University education was open to the very poorest class of the community. Russia was a country which was generally considered to be tremendously backward in its system of education; and yet, even there, the opportunity was afforded to all classes of the people, to those of very small means as well as to the rich, to obtain a Collegiate education. What was now asked was that something like the same advantages should be given to the people of Ireland. They required that Collegiate education should be widened as much as possible in that country, so that those who might desire the advantages of a higher education should not be debarred from obtaining it by the cost of sending their sons to places far away from the localities in which they resided. By concentrating the Colleges in a few of the larger towns they would thereby shut out the poorer classes living in the poorer districts, all of whom ought to be able to share in the educational endowments of the country. As a Western man—as a Connaught man—he felt very strongly on this point. There seemed to be an idea in certain quarters that the Collegiate institutions should be concentrated in Ulster, Leinster, and Munster. To that suggestion he, for one, was very strongly opposed, and he warned the Committee that any proposition of that kind would meet with strong opposition from the Connaught Members in that House. They desired that whatever scheme of Collegiate University education might be adopted hereafter they, in Connaught, should have the advantage of a local educational institution by the maintenance of the Galway College, not under present conditions, because under them it was quite useless, but under such conditions as would enable the Catholic people of Connaught to go to the College and profit by it. They wanted that College to be maintained, so that the people of that Province, who were the poorest people in Ireland, might be enabled to avail themselves of the advantages of the University education of the country.

Mr. O'BRIEN said, the hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) had possessed considerable influence with the late Government; but it did not appear that that influence had rendered any service to the Irish people as far as the question of University education was concerned. At the same time, he must confess that he (Mr. O'Brien) was somewhat disappointed at finding that the Members of the present Administration were not able to see their way to offering some concession to the universal chorus of Irish opinion as expressed from those Benches in reference to the somewhat vague, although he believed he might say enlightened and large-minded, observations which had been made that evening by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer. The right hon. Gentleman had, he thought, plainly confessed that the Queen's Colleges, with the exception of the Belfast College, however good or bad their condition might have originally been, had failed in achieving the purpose for which they were designed, just as the Disestablished Church had failed, and just as every other institution of a distasteful character that the English Government might attempt to acclimatize among the Irish people was bound to fail. It was universally admitted that those Colleges had not done the work they were intended to do; while, on the other hand, it was also generally admitted that the Catholic University College of Dublin had produced what the right hon. Gentleman had rightly called "surprising results." No attempt had been made to defend the Vote the Committee was now asked to pass for these Queen's Colleges; and not the slightest attempt had been made to show that they had accomplished successful work in return for the money that had been granted by Parliament. It seemed to him that if they were asked to vote money under such an unsatisfactory state of affairs for further expenditure on the Queen's Colleges, the least they could expect from the Government was that it should extend a helping hand to an institution which had done far better work, and which to his mind had produced the only good effect which the Royal University had as yet achieved, in having shown that, at all events, the ability lay on the Catholic side, while the endowments were, unfortunately, always on the other. It was utterly impossible to defend a state of things which gave vast endowments for purposes of purely secular education, of which at least four-fifths of the Irish people were unable to avail themselves without wounding their religious feelings and self-respect. The statement made by the right hon. Gentleman, although in one respect encouraging, left the matter in an exceedingly unsatisfactory condition; and he trusted that even yet, before the debate was brought to a close, some Member of the Government would make a satisfactory reply to the observations of his hon. Friend the Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray) with reference to the scheme of University reform which the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had foreshadowed that evening. It was utterly impossible that the Catholics of Ireland should accept as a satisfactory arrangement any proposal based on the same principle as the Intermediate Education Act, or any scheme which merely promised to offer further educational prizes. Equality, absolute equality, in matters of higher education the Catholics of Ireland were determined to have; and he trusted that either now, or, at any rate, in the next Session of Parliament, if the present Government should continue to hold Office, the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer would make up his mind to give up, boldly and once for all, this experiment of the Queen's Colleges, and to offer the Irish people a really National University, with endowments proportioned to the different creeds of the country, so that all parties could share in the education it would afford.

MR. DEASY said, he had to complain that the standard of education in the Queen's College, Cork, was exceedingly low, and that the College produced very few graduates besides medical men. At the same time, however, the College had, in one sense, been a comparative success; and the people of that part of Ireland would sacrifice a great deal before giving up that establishment. Still, he urged it was absolutely necessary that the entire management of that institution should be changed, so that other advantages beyond the practice of medicine might be offered to the graduates. The inferiority of the standard of education in that College had been demonstrated over and over again. He remembered a debate which took place on this question of University education last Session, and on that occasion statistics were adduced by hon. Members on those Benches which tended to show that the standard of education given in the Queen's College, Cork, was much lower than that of almost any similar institution in Ireland. Any young man, not having the slightest knowledge of Latin, Greek, or French, might, in the course of five or six weeks, cram up to pass an examination in that College, and so scramble through, and obtain a degree very often in Edinburgh that would enable him afterwards to practise as a doctor of medicine on the credulity of the people. The people of the Cork district had not the slightest confidence in the existing management of Queen's College, Cork. The Catholics who went there made use of the College because there was no other for them to go to. The Corporation of Cork last year passed a resolution to the effect that the management of the College ought to be changed altogether, and that it should be placed in entirely different hands, so that it might be devoted to the education of the Catholic population. It might be said that that would be an injustice to the Protestants of Munster; but that was not the fact, because the Protestants residing in that part of the country were, for the most part, in a position that would enable them to send their sons to the University at Dublin, whereas the Catholic population were for the most part extremely poor. If the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer imagined that the people of Ireland would be satisfied with the maintenance of the Queen's Colleges in their present state, and would not demand that they should be placed at the disposal of the Catholic population in a manner very different to that in which the funds were at present expended, he was making a great and grievous mistake. The people of the South of Ireland, who ought to be able to avail themselves of the College at Cork, were mainly Catholics; and if they had any other place to send their sons to, they would not send them to the Queen's College, where the education given was merely of a secular character. He trusted that in any scheme Her Majesty's Government might bring forward for the purpose of re-adjusting this question of Irish University education they would have regard to the fact that the Cork Queen's College was in every way admirably equipped for carrying out the work it ought to do, as far as buildings and general appliances were concerned, and that it would be a great mistake to abolish it as an educational establishment, while it would be an equal mistake to continue its present management. In order to satisfy the desires of the Irish people on this point, there ought to be at least two or three Colleges entirely under Catholic control. The Queen's College, Belfast, they would gladly hand over entirely to the Protestants; but they certainly did demand, and would continue to demand until the question was settled to their satisfaction, that they should have fair play in this matter. Fair play was all they asked, and he very much regretted that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not given a more satisfactory response to the representations of the Irish Members. He was glad, however, that they had now an undertaking on the part of the Government that the question should receive their best attention during the autumn; and he hoped the Government would be in a position, if they should retain Office during the next Parliament, to offer better terms than were now accorded to the Irish people. He was sorry the hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon), who had taken the part of the late Government, had not used any of his influence with that Government for the purpose of procuring a proper adjustment of this question. It would have been a matter of the very slightest possible difficulty for the late Government, with its majority of 120 or 130, to have settled the question in any way they might have desired. They knew very well what were the wishes and aspirations of the Irish people; they knew what it was that the Irish Hierarchy demanded; and they might have brought in and passed a measure that would have satisfactorily met those requirements, if they had been so disposed. It was possible that this question would be made one of the war cries of the Liberal Party at the approaching General Election, and the constituencies might be asked to give them their support on the pledge that the question of University education in Ireland would be settled by them in accordance with the wishes and desires of the Irish people. If any such cry should be raised by the Liberal Party, he, for one, should decline to believe them. He should very much prefer to trust even to the partial promise the Chancellor of the Exchequer had given that evening, than to place confidence in the most explicit statements that could be made by any of the Gentlemen occupying seats on the Front Opposition Bench. And with regard to what had fallen from the hon. and learned Member for Kildare, he (Mr. Deasy) was convinced that, in spite of the anxiety of the hon. and learned Gentleman to obtain a settlement of this question, he would be unable to make his views prevail should the late Government again assume Office, unless the Irish Members were returned with sufficient strength to insure acquiescence in their demands. Before concluding his remarks, he must express a hope that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer and his Colleagues would duly consider the position of the Cork Queen's College before the whole question should be decided. He ought to bear in mind that the people of Cork were willing to make almost any sacrifice for the purpose of maintaining the College, as they regarded it as of the utmost importance that some College should exist in that locality. There was a large population in the district who were anxious to avail themselves of such an institution; and, therefore, it would be nothing short of a national disaster if the College were removed. At the same time, they were very desirous of seeing the management of the College changed in the direction he had indicated.

MR. NEWDEGATE said, he had a strong feeling in common with the hon. Members for Ireland, whose neighbour he had been for the last five years. The feeling he had entertained in favour of meeting the legitimate demands of the Irish people had never been lessened. In the great struggle that had inaugurated what was now the old question of commercial policy, he had had for his allies the Irish Members; and they were in the right, for Ireland had undoubtedly suffered severely under that system. And on a recent occasion he was proud to see the Irish Members assisting in vindicating that House against the invasion of Atheism. This had warmed him to Ireland more, perhaps, than any other circumstance in regard to which he had been in alliance with the Irish Members. He must tell those Members, however, that his long experience in that House had warned him that there was an influence dominant in Ireland that would prevent the Irish people from being satisfied with any educational or religious establishment that could be possibly brought into existence or be re-organized by the present Government, unless the preponderating power of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy and of the religious Orders of the Church of Rome were made absolute over such a system. This was a great misfortune to the United Kingdom, and a source of deep suffering to Ireland, and he was sorry to see that the disposition to submit to an alien Power was not relinquished by hon. Members opposite, but that, on the contrary, they took every opportunity of manifesting it. Would hon. Members opposite acknowledge the justice of that observation? [*Cries of* "No!"] He had studied the subject deeply. He believed they would admit he had. He remembered the contest about Maynooth. The House had already yielded on that subject to the demands of the Roman Catholic Party in Ireland. Had that yielding produced anything like a permanent satisfaction? The conduct of his late neighbours on the Opposition Benches proved the contrary that evening. Did they think that the Protestant Members of that House would for ever attempt to satisfy an insatiate demand? He put it to hon. Members opposite, as one who was by no means adverse to them or to their country, that, having been united with them upon one or two great questions, and having thus learnt the value of co-operation, they should endeavour to think for themselves, and free themselves from the domination of that influence which was bent on giving them a separate existence from the rest of the United Kingdom, and so would not allow them to acknowledge the justice of any concession the present Government might be rational enough to make. He had spoken this much with no feeling of ill-will. On the contrary, he fully acknowledged the bonds of union that had existed between him and hon. Members opposite; but he did pray them to break from the Ultramontane dictation of the Church of Rome, for, unless they did, there would be a constant tendency towards feelings of positive hostility against the maintenance of the United Kingdom.

MR. KENNY said, they must accept the promises made by the Government in the belief that they had every desire to fulfil their good intentions with regard to University education in Ireland. Although they did not see their way to accede to the request made from those Benches with regard to the Catholic University College of Dublin, such a step, if they could only agree to take it, had been rendered additionally easy by the fact that the education scheme for the Queen's Colleges had shown a substantial decrease this year—that decrease amounting to nearly £2,000. If the amount of that decrease were to be given for the purpose of assisting in maintaining the Catholic University

College in Dublin, it would, he felt certain, be cheerfully accepted by the Irish Members, and would go a long way towards remedying the extreme inconvenience and difficulty experienced by those who were endeavouring to carry on the work of that Institution. He greatly regretted that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not seen his way to making a grant, even to the extent of £1,700 or £2,000, in the direction demanded. Had he done that, it would have gone far to allay any feeling of irritation that might have existed among the Irish Members on this subject. When the Government dealt with the question next year, he trusted they would do so on the broadest possible basis, and he, for one, should be strongly opposed to any proposal in the direction of removing the existing Queen's Colleges. What was wanted with regard to those Colleges was not that they should be destroyed, but that they might be reformed and turned into really useful institutions, which would be the result, if they were reformed in the direction required by the Irish Members. In that event, he felt certain they would be taken advantage of by the Irish people, notwithstanding the fact that they had hitherto been regarded by popular opinion in Ireland with great aversion, although there could be no doubt that they had effected a considerable amount of good, and had certainly been the means of educating a large number of persons who had subsequently succeeded to positions of great eminence. There were many men who graduated in the Queen's Colleges in Ireland who were at the present time enjoying distinguished positions in England. Many of them had risen to high eminence in England, and many elsewhere. There was nothing in the system itself—in the mere professional teaching belonging to the system—which, so far as he could see, was bad. These Colleges simply required reformation, in the direction in which the people were anxious to obtain it, for the protection of youth, and in certain other respects in which, at present, there was considerable danger. He was certain that, with a little care, these institutions could be made extremely useful and valuable. He was in favour of establishing in Ireland, in support of a great central College, as many University Colleges as possible, where the youth of each county might be sent to study, and thus be properly equipped at the expense of the Government. The expense of the education received ought to be a minimum in a poor country like Ireland. It should be the duty of the Government to undertake the education of the youth of the country; and, to a certain extent, this should be done at the expense of the State, thus reducing the expense of the education to the people as largely as possible, until it reached a minimum, as in Germany, and, to a great extent, in Scotland. In that way, a great deal might be done for the intellectual and moral and social advancement of the people of Ireland, and if it were once recognized that it was to the interest of the State that the youth of the country should be properly educated, the greatest possible advantage would, in the future, flow from the fact.

Colonel NOLAN said, he wished to point out to the hon. Member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate) that he had fallen into a mistake as to the position take up by the Catholic Bishops and priests in Ireland. He (Colonel Nolan) had understood the hon. Gentleman to say that the Catholic Bishops and clergy wanted to be supreme in the Colleges, and the hon. Gentleman went on to warn the Committee against allowing any such supremacy to be established. But, as a matter of fact, they did not wish to be supreme. So far as he (Colonel Nolan) knew their views, and he thought he knew them pretty well, he had always heard them say that, so far from wishing to be supreme, they were most anxious to have a State inspection as to the results obtained—that they would like the State Examiners to see that the pupils were good in mathematics, in medicine, in arts, and in any other subjects that were taught. That he believed to be the opinion of a great majority of the Bishops —he could not, of course, say that it was held by every one of them—and they did not require any supremacy at all. They only wanted to be supreme in one subject—that of religious instruction. Of course, they would like to have their own way on subjects bearing upon religion, and he thought that was a very mild request on their part. Of course, there were certain subjects closely connected with religion where a certain amount of influence should be left to them; and as a general rule, other things being equal, it was no doubt desirable that the students should be taught by people of their own faith. He did not, however, say that there might not be exceptions to this—such subjects, for instance, as mathematics, and certain others—but, as a general rule, teachers of the same faith would be preferred. But they did not object to examiners of any religion examining and testing the students, so that the State which paid the money might see that it got full value for it. The Bishops and clergy, however, did not wish for any supremacy. The hon. Member for North Warwickshire, although he began with pretty compliments, soon lapsed into his older manner of speech; and he (Colonel Nolan) would like to ask that hon. Gentleman to look at the observations which had been made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, for he did not think the hon. Gentleman was present when the Chancellor of the Exchequer addressed the Committee. The Chancellor of the Exchequer reminded the Committee that it seemed absurd now, when religions of all kinds had to contend with infidelity, for one religion to attempt to narrow irreligion by combating with some other religion. Of course, the hon. Member for North Warwickshire was always perfectly sure that he was right in everything—in fact, nobody could be orthodox in the eyes of the hon. Gentleman unless he accepted that hon. Gentleman's particular doxy. The hon. Gentleman was so certain, that he could not imagine the possibility of anybody believing in any other religion having any claim on his consideration. The hon. Gentleman would like the Catholics to join him, but would not allow them any equality in their own religion. But he (Colonel Nolan) was not much afraid of the point which the hon. Gentleman raised. He was not much afraid of an intolerant Protestant spirit in England. He saw very little of it; and he was far more afraid of the advocates of mixed education, who wanted no religion at all. These were the people he was afraid of—they objected to all the Queen's Colleges. He was sorry that the Chancellor of the Exchequer had not risen again to explain his views a little more definitely, for several Members would like a little more definition of views which, though very good so far as they went, would be better if they were more clearly defined. No doubt, one reason why the right hon. Gentleman had not spoken again was the lamentable state of the Front Opposition Bench. There had been no one there during the progress of this important debate. If there had been anyone there to speak and assist the Chancellor of the Exchequer in defining his views, no doubt the right hon. Gentleman might have got up again and placed them before the Committee in a more favourable aspect. As the matter stood, he quite understood the difficulty that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have in speaking again when the usual occupants of the Front Opposition Bench were all absent. Of course, the general outline of the right hon. Gentleman's views was pretty good. The right hon. Gentleman said he was certain that there was not too much money spent on Ireland, and that his idea for the future was that there should be payment by results. He (Colonel Nolan) thought that if the Government would wholly go in for payment by results the system would not be so bad; but he did not see how that could be done. He would not like to see either Trinity College or Belfast College destroyed, for they were doing very good work. The Catholics did not wish to upset the religion of people who differed from them. But if there was payment by results, and Trinity College and Belfast College competed, the share of the Catholics would only be one-half or one-third of what they ought to get. The total sum to be divided was diminished, and the Catholics were handicapped by the fact that the Protestants had this Collegiate training given to them to compete with the Catholics in the open market. Under these circumstances, and remembering what was the general practice and custom all over the world, and that it was the wish of the Irish people that there should be some Collegiate training, he did not think that a bare system of payment by results would do in Ireland. The Catholics ought to have a couple or three Colleges—one in Dublin, one in Galway, and one in Cork. If those Colleges were given to them, he did not at all say that only Catholic students should go through them. They should be protected by a Conscience Clause like that of Trinity College, so that anybody could go through them, and use them just as much as Trinity College was used. This scheme was perfectly feasible—there was no difficulty about it at all. He had heard Catholic clergymen say that the religion of a Catholic was much safer in Trinity College than in the Queen's Colleges; and in the same way, Protestants would be in a better position for keeping their own faith if they were in a Catholic College protected by a strong Conscience Clause than in a College where totally different arrangements prevailed, as in Cork and Galway. This would be the true solution of the question. It was not a new one, for even in the Catholic College now in Dublin, formerly called the Dublin University, Protestants occasionally went in, thinking that they had a better chance of carrying off particular prizes. The Protestants in Galway would not be in a much worse position than now, if at all, and the immense bulk of the population of Galway and Cork would get fair play, which they did not get at present. He hoped that before the present Session of Parliament was brought to a close, or, at all events, immediately afterwards, they would have the views of the Goverment laid fully before the country in a somewhat more definite form. It was only fair, before the great appeal was made to the country, that they should hear a little more from a Conservative Government on this very important question. What they had heard so far was by no means unsatisfactory—it was, on the whole, good, and not wanting in courage on the part of the Government; but he thought they really ought to hear whether they were to have in Ireland a system of education which was to suit the fancies of England, or a system which was to suit Ireland herself. Of course, he agreed with the Chancellor of the Exchequer that all difficulties as to the granting of degrees had been removed by the action taken in 1879. The whole question of education, from its primary up to its University branches, was rapidly becoming in England, Ireland, and Scotland a question of the distribution of money. The Catholics complained that all their endowments put together only amounted to about £6,000, while those of the Protestants, or the mixed endowments, amounted to £104,000; and the Catholics thought that the proportion should be something like half-and-half, or that they themselves ought to get about three-fourths. If they got half-and-half, however, they would be content. But he hoped that the announcement which had been made by the Government would be followed up by something more definite within a reasonable time, because the matter should not be allowed to rest where it was.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he would not trespass upon the Committee with any comments as to the difference between Ultramontanism and what was called Gallicanism, or as to the differences which existed in the Church of Rome itself; but what he feared was that when the proposal of the scheme of the hon. and gallant Member for Galway (Colonel Nolan) and others was made before the House, it would be found to be deeply tinctured with Ultramontanism, which meant the dominion of the Papal Court.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 87; Noes 29: Majority 58.—(Div. List, No. 254.)

(2.) £108,441, to complete the sum for Prisons, Ireland.

Mr. BRODRICK said, he thought the Committee ought to have some few words of explanation with regard to some of the questions involved in the Vote. It would be obvious to any Member of the Committee who had read the Report presented by the Royal Commissioners a year ago, that some explanation was needed for the items in this Estimate, which were obviously incompatible with some of the main suggestions of the Report. The first point which arose was that as to the concentration of the prisons proposed by the Royal Commissioners. He greatly regretted that no Member of the late Administration connected with Irish affairs was now present. He might say that it was a matter for regret that in the whole course of these Estimates, and especially the Irish Estimates, the Front Opposition Bench had been totally, or almost entirely, deserted, and although they all understood that right hon. and hon. Gentlemen did not feel called upon to give so much attention to these matters when they were out of Office as they did when they they were in Office, still, having framed the Estimates themselves, they ought to be here to defend them. The strictures that it might be his duty to pass upon them would, of course, be cast into the empty air; but he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman the present Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir William Hart Dyke) might be able, from the records of his Office, to supply some information as to what seemed to be a considerable lapse of duty on the part of the late Chief Secretary for Ireland. On this question of the concentration of prisons, the Commission had two objects in view—one, better maintenance of discipline in the prisons; and the other, the great decrease of expense which might follow some proper scheme of concentration. With regard to these important matters, a Report was presented nearly a year ago; but no steps had been taken in the past year, and no steps would have been taken now, but for the fact that another Royal Commission was about to visit Ireland, and it was understood that the Home Secretary, who had before acted as Chairman of that Commission, would soon be upon the spot, and as it was known that he took great interest in the subject of artizans' dwellings, some steps were taken by the Lord Lieutenant, and an English official was nominated to consider this matter of prison concentration. In the year 1851, the population of Ireland was over 8,000,000. It was now under 5,000,000. In 1851, the prison population was over 10,000; it is now under 4,000, and consequently the decrease in the prison population had been enormous. A few of the prisons had been closed within the last few years; but the fact remained that there were 24 local prisons containing 1,800 prisoners; that there was an average of 46 prisoners in each of 14 prisons guarded by 14 prison officials; and that in some cases the average of officials was rather more than an officer and a-half to each prisoner. It was clear that some change was needed with regard to the administration of prisons. The changes suggested by the Commission were that minor prisons and bridewells should be shut up, and that as many of the larger as were necessary for the purpose should be devoted to the detention of short-service prisoners. He should like to know what steps had been taken, or what steps were in contemplation, for the purpose of carrying out these recommendations? They had an Estimate of £158,441 for the maintenance of 64 different establishments in a case in which a Royal Commission had declared that 30 would be sufficient, and 13 of which could be handed over to the Constabulary. He certainly thought, therefore, that it was due to the Public Service that this matter should be gone into. Another subject to which he wished to call attention was the position of the Convict Service in Ireland. The Commission—of which the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) was a distinguished Member—decided in 1878 that the time had come to shut up Spike Island Prison. That recommendation had not been carried out. It was in consequence of the first Report of the other Commission that that prison was shut up. As a purely temporary and provisional proceeding, the whole of the prisoners were moved to Mountjoy Prison, and the consequence was that there were detained in that place 500 prisoners. The Commission had dealt with the question of finding proper accommodation. He himself, by the favour of the Chairman of the Prisons Board, had visited Mountjoy Prison a few weeks ago, and from what he saw, he believed the work the convicts were now employed on was absolutely coming to an end, and that they would have nothing to do after next month, and would have to be employed in some informal manner in the prison yard. That, he thought, was a matter with which the Chief Secretary for Ireland should deal with at once. It might be possible to take away two or three large bodies of the convicts temporarily in order to execute works at other places. The prisons to which they were taken would have to be adapted and fitted to receive a larger number of men than they at present accommodated; but, certainly, if the Executive continued to mass this enormous number of convicts at Mountjoy Prison they would be incurring serious responsibility, because it would be done in the face of the recommendation of everyone connected with the Prison Service in Ireland. Another point was, whether the intermediate prisons should be maintained. The Committee were scarcely conversant with the extraordinary expenditure entailed by their maintenance.

The cost of maintaining prisoners at Lusk amounted to no less a sum than £86 per head, and the prison officials of Ireland were strongly of opinion that this expenditure did not come back to the State. Furthermore, he had to complain of the parsimony of the Government in dealing with the recommendations of the Commissioners. It had been recommended that certain repairs and certain necessary sanitary alterations should be carried out—which works would come in this Estimate under Sub-head 2. If the Committee would look at this sub-head, they would find that the total expenditure on these works was estimated at £16,000 a-year. He had reason to believe that when Her Majesty's Government were framing these Estimates in March last, before they had made the extravagant leap in the expenditure in almost every branch of the Public Service that the Committee were so well acquainted with, the Estimates had been cut down in a most extraordinary manner. He had reason to believe that £20,000 was asked for where £16,000 was granted, and that the Treasury, without specifying on what heads the expenditure was to be reduced, without stating that any of the demands made were excessive, or that any of the sanitary operations that were proposed were in any way unnecessary, proceeded to cut down the amount. This was a point which, if the Report were true, deserved explanation. Then, again, with regard to the warders in the local prisons, the Commissioners had come to the conclusion that this was a matter which required to be looked into in order to remove a substantial grievance so far as the pay of these officers was concerned. It was pointed out that the warders who did not get quarters had only 2*s.* 6*d.* a-week for housing, and that it was impossible for a man to house himself, to say nothing of his family, for that amount. The result was that the warders were obliged to obtain lodgings in places where they had to run the risk of the worst associations, especially in crowded towns. So far as he could make out, no steps had been taken in the direction of giving relief in this matter. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant would be able to throw some light upon it. One further remark he (Mr. Brodrick) had to make, and that was with reference to the Inspectors. The constitution of the Board, as the Commissioners had found it, was one member at £1,200 a-year, one at £1,100, and one at £1,000. The Committee had recommended that one of these offices should be discontiued, the post being occupied in the future by a medical officer—that was to say, that a medical officer should be placed on the staff, though not upon the Board. It had also been recommended that the number of Inspectors should be reduced from three to two, and that the salaries should be decreased, so as to effect a net saving of £400 a-year to the Treasury. The Treasury, however, when the demand was made on them, declared that they would not allow any sum for the two medical officers who would replace the retiring officials, unless the £1,000—pay of the Inspector—was given up. By the arrangement adopted, therefore, the Treasury effected a saving of £600 a-year, instead of the £400 recommended by the Commissioners. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman would see that these officials were adequately paid, looking at the responsible nature of the duty they had to discharge, and that he would be able to give him a satisfactory explanation of the points he had raised, so that he might not be obliged to bring before the House a Motion on the subject.

Mr. HASTINGS said, he agreed with what had fallen from the hon. Member (Mr. Brodrick) with regard to the necessity of carrying out the recommendations of the Royal Commission as to buildings, and the reduction of the number of those small prisons which could never be rendered effective. But there were evils to be found quite as great as those which arose from structural arrangements—evils which appeared to him to be incidental to the present mode of prison administration in Ireland. One fact alone, pointed out by the Royal Commissioners, spoke volumes as to the present mode of prison administration—he meant with regard to the extraordinary amount of change which was constantly going on amongst the prison officials. The Commissioners pointed out that out of the 558 officials appointed since April, 1878, only 228 remained at present in the Service. Thus an extraordinary number of officials had left the Service in the course of seven years.

What must that mean? Why, in the first place, that there was a considerable amount of inefficiency in the staff itself. New officers were constantly being brought in, and many seemed to be very little acquainted with their duties; and he could only say, as Chairman of the Visiting Justices of a prison of a good many years' standing, that he should be very sorry indeed to have to conduct the prison with which he was officially connected under such circumstances. He thought also that the fact to which he had referred showed that there had been considerable mismanagement in the treatment of these officers. They were, he presumed, tolerably well paid; he presumed they were entitled to pensions after a certain number of years' service; but the fact that so many of them passed out of the Service, by voluntary resignation or otherwise, showed that there were grave grounds for discontent. One of these grounds was disclosed by the Royal Commission. It appeared that when what was considered an injustice was inflicted upon the officials, they were denied the right of appeal, and had no means of making known their grievances to the higher authorities. In one case, a Governor had sent in a complaint to the Lord Lieutenant; but the Chairman of the Prison Board had refused to allow the complaint to be lodged. That alone showed that the prison administration was conducted on very different lines in Ireland to those which were followed in England and Scotland. Then, again, there were the grave facts which had been brought to light by the Royal Commission—to whom, he thought, the public were greatly indebted for the statements they had made—as to the treatment of prisoners. The Commissioners had remarked upon the extraordinary number of punishments inflicted in Irish prisons as compared with those inflicted in English and Scotch prisons, and the treatment of prisoners who were on the border land between sanity and insanity. He (Mr. Hastings) was not surprised that it was shown in the Report that a large number of prisoners passed that border, and, becoming insane, had to be sent to criminal lunatic asylums. He had no doubt many hon. Members would support him—those hon. Members who, like himself, had had experience of prison administration—when he said that cases of semi-insanity constantly came before prison officials—that was to say, cases in which prisoners were in that condition of mind that harsh treatment would probably cause them to become permanently insane; whereas kindness, forbearance, and patience would bring them round into a very reasonable state of mind before they left the prison. He must say that that House, as the guardian of the liberties of the people, ought to feel strongly on such a subject as that which had been brought to light by the Royal Commission — the treatment of prisoners who were not fully responsible for their actions through mental infirmity. But, then, as to ordinary prisoners, there seemed to be considerable doubt as to whether they were treated properly, especially those who were in custody awaiting trial—a class who, unquestionably, had a right to proper consideration until the fact of their guilt had been established. There were many other points of this character which he could go into, but as to which he did not propose to detain the Committee. He hoped the Administration, which contained the right hon. Gentleman who had done such good service as Chairman of the Royal Commission, and to whom the whole country was indebted for the Prisons Act which applied to England, would take care that the recommendations of the Royal Commission which had been alluded to should be examined into, and, wherever possible, carried into effect. He trusted that some change would be made in regard to the Irish local prisons. There should be a reconstitution of the Prisons Board; but, above all, the recommendation of which the Committee had been reminded, and which would involve the placing of a medical officer on the staff, should be carried out. In his opinion, however, this medical gentleman should be not a mere subordinate of the Board, but a member of it, capable of using an independent voice and of exercising due weight with his colleagues. Then there should be an effort made to obtain the same amount of intelligent and independent inspection of prisons as was exercised in England. There were able gentlemen in Ireland—gentleman quite as capable of acting on Visiting Committees as any in England; and he thought that greater efforts should be made than had ever yet been made by the Chief

Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant to establish Discharged Prisoners' Aid Societies in connection with Irish local prisons, as had been done in connection with local prisons in England. He could assert, from experience, that an enormous amount of good was done in this country in assisting prisoners in this way—good which was not confined to prisoners released from gaol, but which extended to prisoners still under sentence. He had been astonished to read in this Report of the Commission that in a country like Ireland, which was full of benevolent and religious-minded people, there were only two places where societies for the assistance of discharged prisoners were in force—namely, Dublin and Belfast. In England, these societies had been fostered by the Home Office and by grants from this House. As to convict prisons in Ireland, everyone who glanced at the figures would see that their cost of administration was enormous. It was as much as £50 a-head in Irish prisons, on an average, whereas in England it was no more than £38. How was this? Ireland was not a more expensive country to live in than England; salaries were not higher there; food did not cost more. Then why it was that in Ireland the average cost of a convict was £50, whilst in England it was only £38, altogether passed his comprehension. In conclusion, he urged the evils he had alluded to on the attention of the Government. In particular, let them see that those grievances which brought about constant changes amongst the prison officials were remedied, looking at the desirability of having experienced and trustworthy officers in the gaols. These subjects, he felt, were difficult to deal with properly without more time than hon. Members now had at their disposal. However, he earnestly trusted that the Department would allow some satisfactory result to follow from this discussion.

Mr. T. A. DICKSON said, he was sure the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross), who had been Chairman of the Prisons Commission, would do all in his power to carry out the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Irish Prisons. No one in the House was better acquainted with the abuses which existed in the Irish prisons than the Home Secretery, and he (Mr. Dickson) was sure that when the right hon. Gentleman came to deal with the matter he would press the Lord Lieutenant to carry out the various recommendations made by the Royal Commissioners. One recommendation of the Commissioners which the hon. Gentleman the Member for West Surrey (Mr. Brodrick) had referred to was most important—namely, the consolidation of the Irish prisons. In England there were 64 prisons with a daily average of 18,000 prisoners, whilst in Ireland there were 69 prisons with a daily average of 2,700 prisoners. Surely these figures showed there was ample scope for economy and consolidation; and yet, so far as he knew, the late Government had taken no steps to carry out the recommendations of the Commission. He believed, as he had said, the number of prisons in Ireland was still 69; and they must all know that when 2,700 prisoners were scattered over that number of prisons, there could be no proper supervision or control or discipline exercised, and the result was, as his hon. Friend had pointed out, that the cost of keeping up the prisons—at so much per head per prisoner—was much greater in Ireland than it was in England. The hon. Gentleman had also referred to the reconstitution of the Prisons Board. When it was remembered that it was stated in evidence before the Royal Commission on which he (Mr. Dickson) had sat, that for years the members of the Prisons Board had had no communication with each other, except by writing, and had not met, as they should have done, at the Board to discharge their duties—had not spoken to each other even, except by letter—and when it was remembered that there was no cordiality between the members, it would be admitted that the Public Service must have suffered enormously. He was strongly of opinion that the late Government should have reconstituted the Board and formed a new one. He did not wish to deal harshly with the present members; but, certainly, if he had had authority in this matter, he should have superannuated them and have appointed a new Board. There was one other point he wished to call the attention of the Chief Secretary of Ireland to, and that was the question of the architect to the Prisons Board. He saw an item down for the salary of this person; but there was a foot-note in regard to it which he did not understand—namely,

> "The architect's salary has been estimated only to the 30th September, 1885, inclusive, that being the date on which the additional nine months for which his employment has been sanctioned will expire."

He should like to know whether the services of the present prisons' architect would be dispensed with on the 30th September next? The present architect had admitted in evidence that when he was appointed he knew nothing whatever about prison architecture, that he had never been in a prison, and that he knew nothing whatever about the sanitary arrangements of these places. He had said that—

> "Though the only architect appointed to look after the Irish prisons, he had known nothing whatever of their sanitary arrangements."

He (Mr. Dickson) was quoting the architect's own words given in evidence. What had been the result of this gentleman's ignorance of prison architecture and sanitary science? Why, that in the prison at Omagh, four deaths took place within three or four years owing to defective sanitation. The attention of the Prisons Board was called to the matter from the year 1876 to 1883, during which period the Governor lost three members of his family by fever. The Governor applied for a change, and was sent to Galway, and another person was sent to take his place. The new Governor arrived with his wife and family; but before he could unpack his furniture, he was attacked with typhoid fever and died. The whole drainage system of the prison was most defective, and had been neglected for years. The Commissioners, in their Report, declared that an architect should be appointed who knew something of prison architecture and sanitary science, and that a larger salary should be paid in the future. He (Mr. Dickson) should like to know from the Chief Secretary for Ireland whether anything had been done in consequence of that Report? There was one other point that the Home Secretary would be familiar with, and that was in regard to the stores and contracts of the prisons. He (Mr. Dickson) did not think anything could possibly be worse than the whole of the commercial arrangements in connection with the Irish prisons—the system of supplies, of stores, and of contracts. He would undertake to say that any ordinary commercial man, accustomed to buying and selling, who went over to Ireland to supervise the contracts of the Irish prisons would easily save the State £10,000 a-year. In Ireland, for some articles as much as £3 per ton was given more than was paid in England, and evidence to that effect had been given by the English storekeepers. With regard to the punishments which had been practised in the Irish prisons, he believed that if the Royal Commission had done nothing else, all the trouble and expense it had caused was more than requited by the change effected by it in connection with these abuses. The punishments that had existed in Ireland were unknown in England; and he quite agreed with his hon. Friend that the punishments in Irish gaols, in connection with what were known as muffs and dark cells, drove many a poor wretch over the borderland into hopeless insanity. This, no doubt, accounted for the large percentage which they had in their Irish prisons of lunatic prisoners. As he had already said, he was glad that this subject had been brought under the notice of the Home Secretary, who knew better than anyone in the House the abuses which existed in the Irish prisons, and he earnestly trusted that the right hon. Gentleman would direct his attention to the matter in the endeavour to carry out the recommendations of the Royal Commission.

MR. SEXTON said, he hoped that the Home Secretary, now that he had come into power, would see that the recommendations of the Commission were carried out. Those recommendations had come from Gentlemen of various shades of opinion. The warders' grievances should be attended to. These persons had difficult and fatiguing duties to perform for slight remuneration, and he hoped to hear from the Government that the reasonable recommendation of the Commission in the matter of the warders' salaries would be speedily carried into effect. What did the right hon. Gentleman think of the case of the warder who had passed as a teacher in Marlborough Street, Dublin? There had been an indisposition to appoint him to a school, owing to his being a Catholic; and, in the end, failing to get an engagement, he had taken a situation as warder in a prison. Whilst acting in that capacity, the Marlborough Street authorities had claimed the £40 they had spent on his education, and the Prison authorities, allowing the claim, had deducted a weekly amount from his wages, which reduced his income to such a low sum that he was unable to pay for his food and washing, and had been obliged to get into debt. He (Mr. Sexton) hoped something would be done to put a stop to such a state of things as that. Then, he desired to mention the case of a man driven over the border land of insanity by prison treatment—the case of Bartholomew Nolan, who had been in gaol, and who, immediately on obtaining his discharge, murdered his wife. The charge originally made against him was that of making an attack on a dwelling-house, and though he was found guilty, the evidence given on his trial strongly favoured the presumption of his innocence. His incarceration and the prison treatment unseated his reason—a circumstance which, again, favoured the presumption of his innocence, for he would be more likely to become insane suffering the accessories of penal servitude if innocent than he would be if guilty. The account he gave of himself, after murdering his wife, was that the devil came into his breast one night in his cell and prompted him to kill his wife. The state of the man's mind came before the authorities of Mountjoy Prison, and he was removed to another place of detention, and seeing that doubts existed as to his insanity, he (Mr. Sexton) could not help thinking that those who had released him had incurred great responsibility. The first thing the man's daughter said, when she heard of her mother's death, was—"Why did they let my father out of prison to come and murder my poor mother?" It was perfectly apparent that the man ought to have been sent to a lunatic asylum. The demand he (Mr. Sexton) made in this case was that the Government should make a strict inquiry into the treatment that man received in prison, and ascertain whether any manifestations of insanity had been made, and should lay on the Table any records which might have been made by the prison doctor or any other individual as to his state of mind whilst he was in gaol. It was evident that no greater evil could arise than that men showing signs of insanity in prison should be released and thrown upon society in that state. One other case he had to refer to, which was that of a man who was now in gaol. It was one of those cases to which Earl Spencer had refused to give any attention—but if a messenger from Heaven had come to him with a tale of injustice, he would have turned his back upon him. As there was a new Government in power, however, a Government which was not responsible for Earl Spencer's proceedings, he (Mr. Sexton) would like to ask them what would be done in this case. A woman, Maria Egan, wrote to him on behalf of her husband, John Egan, who was confined in Castlebar Prison for an assault committed on a man named John Walsh on 27th December, 1883. The woman declared that her husband was innocent—a natural enough statement for her to make, and one which was not likely to have much weight with the authorities, seeing that it came from the man's wife. But her assertion was not unsupported. She declared that a man named John McManns was ready to come forward and plead guilty to the assault for which her husband had been condemned. On that representation, he (Mr. Sexton) had replied to the woman that it was useless for her to say that her husband was innocent, that no declaration of that kind would have any effect on the authorities, and that a declaration of the other man's guilt should be made before the police, or that the guilty man should be got to make a declaration of his own guilt. The guilty man, therefore, went before a Justice of the Peace for the county of Mayo, and made the following declaration:—

"I, John McManns, of Derryned, in the county of Mayo, of the age of 23 years and upwards, make oath and say as follows:—

"1. I do solemnly and sincerely declare that the assault for which one John Egan, who is now undergoing imprisonment for the last nine months in Castlebar Gaol, was committed by me on one John Walsh, for the assaulting of whom the said John Egan is so imprisoned.

"2. I do solemnly and sincerely declare that I am now ready and willing to abide any prosecution that may be instituted by the Crown against me, by reason of my having committed said assault as aforesaid.

"3. I do solemnly and sincerely declare that said assault was committed by me on the 27th day of December, 1883, at a place called Derryned, in the county of Mayo.

> "Sworn before me this 23rd day of December, 1884.
>
> his
> "JOHN ⋈ McMANNS.
> mark.
>
> "Signed,
> "JOSEPH McD. DAREY,
> "Justice of said county."

That declaration was transmitted to the Lord Lieutenant at the end of last year. On the 2nd of January, the Lord Lieutenant replied—

> "Dublin Castle, 2nd January, 1885.
>
> "Maria Egan,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your memorial and enclosure on behalf of John Egan, a prisoner in Castlebar Prison, and to acquaint you that, on a full consideration of all the circumstances of the case, the Lord Lieutenant has decided that the law must take its course.
>
> "W. L. B. KAYE."

No inquiry was made—no observation in this letter on the sworn testimony of the man McManns. He (Mr. Sexton) had no hesitation in saying that if such a case as this had occurred in England, it would have been looked into. This unfortunate man had now suffered over a year's imprisonment. It was to be hoped that he would be released, even at so late a period as this, otherwise the imprisonment would continue until March. He had no doubt the guilty man would be willing still further to confirm his declaration of guilt.

MR. MARUM said, he hoped something would be done in the way of consolidating the prisons in Ireland. The subject was one in which he had taken some interest, having several times brought it before the House. A prison was wanted for the county of Kilkenny, great inconvenience being experienced at present through having to convey prisoners from place to place. He pointed in particular to one case in which a woman who had made some resistance had been tied to a car with ropes and driven 11 miles, and then taken by train to Waterford. He trusted that the Chief Secretary for Ireland would be able to promise that the matter should receive his attention, and that no time would be lost in dealing with it.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE) said, he was placed in rather an unfortunate position owing to the multiplicity of subjects to which his attention had been drawn, and with which he had been asked to deal. He certainly felt most strongly that if he did in the future neglect the duties of his Office it would not be for want of critics. He had not only listened to-night to very able and intelligent critics, but he had the Chairman of the Royal Commission on his left, and other hon. Gentlemen before him who had either taken part in its labours, or interested themselves in its investigations, and with the remarks of these hon. Gentlemen he did not at all quarrel. During the short time he had been in Office, it had, of course, been impossible for him to deal adequately with all the matters which had been referred to in the course of this discussion; but he could assure the Committee that, in the future, he should consider it his duty to carry out the recommendations of the Prisons Commission in a broad and fair spirit. He had to thank the hon. Gentleman the Member for West Surrey (Mr. Brodrick) for the manner in which he had brought the subject forward. With regard to the consolidation of prisons in Ireland, the hon. Member had said that the recommendations of the Commission had not been carried out as they ought to have been. There might be difficulties in Ireland in connection with this matter which might not be found to exist in England, and, so far as his experience went, he believed that the work of consolidation had been stayed on account of some opinion which had been given by the Law Officers of the Crown. He could not say why that opinion was given, but there could be no doubt that it was well-founded. It was, however, evident that if they had an extensive prison system and a large number of prisons for the confinement of only a small number of prisoners, the cost of those prisoners must be very large. With regard to the large number of prisoners in the Mountjoy Prison, to which his hon. Friend (Mr. Brodrick) had called attention, he could only say that he was obliged to him for so directing his attention to the matter. Then, as to Lusk Prison, and the large cost per head of the prisoners, so far as his information went, that large cost was brought about by the cause mentioned—namely, the reduction which had taken place in the number of prisoners, whilst the establishment continued in its normal condition. No doubt, the cost of the prisoners per head was much larger than it ought to be. With regard to the pay of the warders, the matter had been taken into consideration; but pending the settlement of the larger question of the consolidation of prisons, the time was not ripe for making an increase. With regard to the Inspectors, it was proposed by the Commission to increase their pay to a maximum of £700. This proposal the Government could not adopt. It had been decided, in accordance with the recommendations of the Commissioners, to reduce the number of superior officers. It had been found necessary to appoint a medical Inspector, at a salary of £800 a-year. At first sight, the new arrangements appeared somewhat hard on the lay Inspectors; but, as a matter of fact, their responsibilities in some important respects would be considerably reduced. The very large question of prison discipline had been raised by an hon. Member opposite, and he (Sir William Hart Dyke) could not, upon his very short experience of Office, pretend to go into it. He would admit, however, that the question was well worthy of consideration. As to the general inspection of prisons, points had been strongly urged by the Commissioners, and he could only promise hon. Gentlemen that he would endeavour to see that that part of the Report of the Commission was carried out. Then, the general prison expenditure had also been alluded to. There had been a large increase in the Vote he was aware—a very large increase, amounting to £6,411. He might remind the Committee that a large portion of it came under Sub-head "G," Victualling Department, two pints of milk having been added to the dietary, Class II. Under Sub-head "N" there had been a considerable increase for the escort and conveyance of prisoners under the Prisons Amendment Act of 1884. The Downpatrick Prison had been converted into a convict prison, and the cost had been £400, with £1,155 for increased staff. Expenditure had also been incurred in converting the Maryborough Prison into an invalid prison for convicts. He was afraid he had not gone into all the various questions raised; but he could only promise that all these matters would receive his earnest attention, and that he did not feel in the slightest degree disposed to shirk any of them.

Mr. BRODRICK said, he had to thank the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir William Hart Dyke) for the answer he had given to the various questions which had been addressed to him, and to express his confidence that the right hon. Gentleman would endeavour to deal with the Report of the Commission in the spirit in which it was presented. There was one other point on which he desired to ask his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland), and it was, whether it was, or was not, the fact that the Treasury cut off the large sum of £4,000 from the Estimates of the year, without any reference to any particular item? He hoped the hon. Gentleman would be able to assure the Committee that that was not the fact. He also hoped the hon. Gentleman would be able to grant the extra allowances to the Inspectors.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he would not have intervened in this debate if his name had not been mentioned, nor did he wish to detain the Committee more than a few moments. He should like, however, to impress on the Committee the very important fact that the Commission was composed of men of all shades of opinion. It was the greatest satisfaction to him, and he believed to all his Colleagues, that they were able to present an absolutely unanimous Report. The Lord Lieutenant was a man of very great experience; but he (Sir R. Assheton Cross) promised His Excellency that every possible assistance he could give him would be entirely at his disposal. He could also promise his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury that he would find no effort on his (Sir R. Assheton Cross's) part wanting to enable him to supply the funds which would be necessary to start this work. There was no doubt that, with regard to all the matters relating to discipline and to the comfort of untried prisoners, a material improvement had already taken place. The question of consolidation, which was really at the root of the whole matter, was one which must be pressed on the Executive Government in Ireland. He believed that, in the long run, the proposed consolidation would result in a great saving to the Treasury. He was very glad to hear that his right hon. Friend was so anxious to carry out the recommendations of the Commissioners, and hoped that before another year had passed some progress would be made in the matter.

MR. SEXTON said, he would point out that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland had not replied to the questions put to him respecting the increase of the warders' salaries, and also respecting the case of the man Nolan.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE) said, he included the question regarding the warders' salaries in the matters which he said had not come under his cognizance. With reference to the case of the man Nolan, he promised the hon. Member for Sligo to make every inquiry.

Vote *agreed to.*

COLONEL NOLAN, in moving to report Progress, said, he did not wish to be obstinate; but he would like to know what Vote the Government intended to take to-night?

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Colonel Nolan.*)

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) said, it was intended to take the Bechuanaland Vote.

SIR ROBERT FOWLER (LORD MAYOR) said, he must appeal to the Government not to take the Bechuanaland Vote that night. It was most important that the Vote should be taken at a time when the debate could be fully reported. It was very necessary that his right hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Stanley) should make his statement at a reasonable time, and that it should find its way into the public prints. He understood, too, that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) wished to address the Committee on the subject. The speeches of those right hon. Gentlemen on this subject might not excite any great feeling in this country; but they would be read with interest at the Cape. He hoped the Government would not persist in taking the Vote that night.

COLONEL NOLAN asked for leave to withdraw his Motion. ["No, no!"]

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he thought that, at that hour (1.20), it was not unreasonable that they should report Progress, especially as there was a very important subject to be brought forward. There were only three Votes in Supply remaining, and they could be very well discussed to-morrow.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel STANLEY) said, he had hoped that there would be no objection to take this Vote to-night. He had postponed it four or five times, in the endeavour to meet the convenience of various Members of the Committee, and he was rather led to believe that that night there would be no objection to take the Vote, looking to the time of the year and the general state of Supply. The statement he had to make upon the Vote was of a comparatively brief nature, and he did not think it would lead to any prolonged discussion. He was afraid that if they postponed the Vote until to-morrow, they would not have the presence of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster). The Vote was not for a large amount, being one only intended to cover the existing services for the year. He hoped the Committee would take the Vote now, particularly as another opportunity would be afforded for discussing it.

MR. SEXTON said, that if the Government did not propose to take any other Vote but that for Bechuanaland, he should recommend his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Nolan) to withdraw his Motion.

SIR FARRER HERSCHELL said, he would submit to right hon. Gentlemen on the Treasury Bench that the Opposition were entitled to a little consideration. Hon. Members sitting below the Gangway got the Votes in wh they were interested fixed just as they pleased. ["Oh!"] He did not co plain of hon. Members getting that; but he did submit to the Government that some consideration should be shown to those who sat in the Opposition part of the House, when they made a request that a Vote should not be taken at a time when they considered it could not be properly discussed. The Bechuanaland Vote did not stand next. The Vote for National Education in Ireland was the next Vote in order; but that had been postponed because hon. Members desired its postponement. The Post Office Vote was not to be taken that night, because hon. Members below the Gangway wished it should not. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had just said that if the Government would not proceed with any Vote but that for Bechuanaland, he should recommend his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Nolan) to withdraw the Motion to report Progress. Surely, under the circumstances, it was not an unreasonable appeal that was now made. It could not be suggested that any Members of the Opposition had done anything to impede the progress of the Estimates. He knew there were Members who felt very strongly that this Vote should not be taken at this time.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel STANLEY) said, that rather than there should be any wrangling, he would not proceed with the Vote. He had thought it was to the convenience of certain right hon. Gentlemen opposite that the Vote should come on that night.

MR. R. H. PAGET said, he hoped the Vote would be taken that night. If hon. Gentlemen desired to discuss the Vote when the proceedings could be fully reported, they would have an opportunity of doing so on Report of Supply. The hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Nolan) had expressed a desire to withdraw the Motion to report Progress. He (Mr. R. H. Paget) hoped it would be withdrawn.

MR. MOLLOY said, the proposition of the hon. and learned Gentleman for Durham (Sir Farrer Herschell) was that the Committee should proceed with the Post Office Vote that night, and postpone the Bechuanaland Vote until to-morrow. The Irish Members were in the House during the whole of last night, and remained in attendance till half-past 3. They were obliged to be present on account of Bills being brought on in which they were interested. Where was the hon. and learned Gentleman? He was not present.

SIR FARRER HERSCHELL: I was the last person in the House, and spoke on the last Bill which was taken.

MR. MOLLOY said, that last night the Irish Members were in attendance; and, if he remembered aright, the Liberal Benches were remarkable for their emptiness. They had been at work the whole of that night, and since 6 o'clock the Liberal Benches had only had one occupant, and he was asleep. He considered that the Irish Members were entitled to as much consideration as right hon. Gentlemen on the Front Opposition Benches, and therefore he strongly objected to the taking of the Post Office Vote.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR WAR (Mr. W. H. SMITH) said, the Government desired to put an end to this conversation—it was really only wasting the time of the Committee. If right hon. Gentlemen opposite did not wish to take the Vote, the Government had no wish to press it on. His right hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Stanley) only proposed to take the Vote because he was aware that several Members were remaining in the House to discuss it. The Government would consent to report Progress, and put the Vote down for to-morrow.

THE CHAIRMAN said, it was necessary that the Motion be withdrawn, in order that he could put the Question that the Resolutions be reported to the House.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

Committee to sit again *To-morrow.*

SUPPLY.—REPORT.

Resolutions [27th July] *reported.*

Resolutions 1 to 29, inclusive, *agreed to.*

(30.) "That a Supplementary sum, not exceeding £16,000, be granted to Her Majesty, to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, in Aid of the Cost of Maintenance of Disturnpiked and Main Roads in England and Wales during the year ending on the 25th day of March 1886."

MR. MARUM said, that this was a Vote of £16,000 for Disturnpiked and other Roads in England and Wales. There had already been voted £215,000 for roads in England and Wales, and £35,000 for roads in Scotland. The Votes taken for County Court Houses and Sheriffs' Courts brought the sum that had been voted in easement of the taxation of counties in England, Scotland, and Wales, to the round figure of £350,000. There was nothing of the kind voted for Ireland. A similar sum voted to Ireland would amount to something like £3,500 to each county in easement of local taxation. He would like to hear what was the reason of such an enormous sum being given in aid of local taxation in England, Scotland, and Wales, and not a farthing being given to Ireland?

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. Balfour) reminded the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Marum) that the present arrangement was made by the late Government two years ago. The subvention was not given to Ireland, because in that country there was no Carriage Tax. Of course, the Government had not pretended to give a reconsideration to the whole question of subventions in aid of local taxation. All they had done was to take the basis laid down by their Predecessors, and, in accordance with that basis, to propose to the Committee the Supplementary Estimate which was absolutely necessary. Any reconsideration of the question which might be necessary must be reserved for a future time.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA said, it was no argument to say that this subvention was not extended to Ireland, because there was no Carriage Tax in that country. All the Imperial taxation levied in Ireland had been measured against the Imperial taxation levied in England, by ascertaining what Income Tax it would take in order to pay off the taxation. In England, an Income Tax of 2*s.* 6½*d.* in the pound would discharge all the Imperial taxation; but it would require an Income Tax of 5*s.* 3*d.* in the pound to discharge all the taxation which was levied in Ireland. He did not want to argue the point now; but it was ridiculous to talk about the non-extension of assessed taxation to Ireland, when Ireland paid in proportion to her income more than double England paid upon her income.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN said, he did not think this was the time to enter into the consideration of the imposition of assessed taxes in Ireland, and, therefore, if his hon. Friend (Mr. Marum) went to a division, he (Sir Patrick O'Brien) would vote in opposition to him.

Colonel NOLAN said, the argument used by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. A. J. Balfour) was a very dangerous one for Irish ratepayers. The fact remained that money was voted in aid of local taxation in England and Scotland, and none was voted for a similar purpose in Ireland. It was said that Ireland did not pay a Carriage Tax; but the Irish people paid an enormous sum upon their alcohol. It was very hard that a rich country like England should receive a handsome grant towards its roads, and that a poor country like Ireland should receive nothing at all. However, he did not wish to press the matter now, because the present Government had not had time to turn their attention to it.

Resolution *agreed to.*

Remaining Resolutions *agreed to.*

COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) (PENSIONS) BILL.—[Bill 112.]

(*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Mr. SEXTON begged to move the adjournment of the debate. He had an Amendment on the Paper against the Bill, and he thought it would not be convenient to enter into it at so late an hour.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Debate be now adjourned,"—(*Mr. Sexton,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Committee *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

LUNACY LAWS AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Arthur Balfour, Mr. Stuart - Wortley.*)

[BILL 244.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Mr. WARTON said, he did not wish to delay the progress of this Bill; but he had an Amendment on the Paper to one of the clauses. He desired to point out to the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. A. J. Balfour) the difference between some of the provisions in the Bill and those in 5 & 6 *Vict.* c. 97. In the present Bill, the pauper lunatic and the lunatic who was not a pauper, but was simply walking about, were jumbled up in a most remarkable way. It would have been far better if they had followed the wording of the old Act. It would have been better if Section 2 had been divided, so as to have made a distinction between these two classes of lunatics. He would not move his Amendment, but recommended the matter to the attention of the right hon. Gentleman.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) expressed a hope that the hon. and learned Member would not delay the progress of the measure. Without the Bill, pauper lunatics had to be taken to the police station and placed in a cell, which was perhaps one of the worst places that a lunatic could be put into. Therefore, he hoped the hon. and learned Member would not press his Amendment.

Bill *reported*, without Amendment.

House *resumed.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND [SALARIES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the salary of a Secretary for Scotland, and of any officials who may be appointed under the provisions of any Act of the present Session for appointing a Secretary for Scotland.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS, &C. [ADVANCES.]

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

(1.) *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise advances out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, or out of moneys in the hands of the National Debt Commissioners held on account of Savings Banks, of any sum of money not exceeding £3,000,000 in the whole, to enable the Public Works Loans Commissioners, and not exceeding £1,500,000 in the whole, to enable the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland, to make advances in promotion of Public Works.

(2.) *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise further advances out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of any sum or sums of money, not exceeding £100,000 in the whole, to enable the Land Commission in Ireland to make advances, or for the purchase of Estates, in pursuance of "The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881," and "The Tramways and Public Companies (Ireland) Act, 1883."

(3.) *Resolved*, That it is expedient to empower the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury to reduce from five to four per cent. per annum the rate of interest payable on the debt due to the Public Works Loan Commissioners by "The Londonderry and Lough Swilly Railway Act, 1883."

(4.) *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Public Works Loan Commissioners to remit all sums due in respect of the North and South Lanarkshire and East and West Lanarkshire Roads over and above the sum of £6,287 3*s.* 7*d.* and the interest thereon, in respect of the debt of the North and South Lanarkshire Roads, and over and above the sum of £4,549 10*s.* and the interest thereon, in respect of the debt of the East and West Lanarkshire Roads.

(5.) *Resolved*, That it is expedient to authorise the Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland to remit the sum of £440 2*s.* 2*d.* being the amount with interest of a debt due by Timothy Moore in respect of certain buildings erected as dwellings for the labouring classes in Dublin.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

POOR LAW GUARDIANS, IRELAND [COST OF PROSECUTIONS].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the payment of Costs of Prosecutions, and compensation for loss of time, which may be incurred under the provisions of any Act of the present Session for amending the Law relating to the Election of Poor Law Guardians in Ireland, in like manner as the Expenses of Prosecution in cases of felony in Ireland are paid.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 29*th July*, 1885.

MINUTES.]—SUPPLY—*considered in Committee*—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART, Vote 14; CLASS V.—FOREIGN AND COLONIAL SERVICES, Vote 7; REVENUE DEPARTMENTS; CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES—CLASS I.—PUBLIC WORKS AND BUILDINGS; £500 (SUPPLEMENTARY) GORDON MONUMENT.

Resolutions [July 28] *reported.*

WAYS AND MEANS—*considered in Committee*—£45,361,227, Consolidated Fund.

RESOLUTIONS IN COMMITTEE—Navy and Army Expenditure, 1883-4.

PRIVATE BILLS (*by Order*)—*Lords Amendments to Commons Amendments agreed to*—Rathmines and Rathgar Township.

PUBLIC BILLS — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Public Works Loans* [254]; East India, Army Pensions Deficiency* [255].

First Reading — Ecclesiastical Commissioners (No. 2)* [253].

Report of Select Committee — Crown Lands* [51].

Committee — Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment* [250]—R.P.
Committee—Report— Revising Barristers* [237].
Third Reading—Elementary Education Provisional Orders Confirmation (Pirmingham, &c.)* [228]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Public Health Act) (No. 2)* [212], and *passed.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

—o—

RATHMINES AND RATHGAR TOWNSHIP BILL [*Lords*] (*by Order.*)

Lords Amendment to Commons Amendments *considered.*

MR. SEXTON said, he believed that the Lords had taken out certain words from the Amendment which had been proposed by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy). He (Mr. Sexton) was not in a position to judge what the exact effect of the Lords Amendment would be; but the Parliamentary Agent had assured him that the only effect of making it was to render the provision more operative. If the right hon. Gentleman the Chairman of Ways and Means accepted the assurance of the Parliamentary Agent he (Mr. Sexton) would not object to the Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN (Sir ARTHUR OTWAY) said, he was quite prepared to accept the Lords Amendment. He had not had an opportunity of carefully considering the matter; and he was bound to rely very much upon the judgment of the Parliamentary Agent. But as he had always found that the view of the Parliamentary Agent was never misleading, he was quite prepared to accept the Amendment on the assurance which had been given.

Lords Amendment to Commons Amendments *agreed to.*

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

SUPPLY—CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

SUPPLY—*considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

CLASS IV.—EDUCATION, SCIENCE, AND ART.

(1.) Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That a sum, not exceeding £466,303, be granted to Her Majesty, to complete the sum necessary to defray the Charge which will come in course of payment during the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, for the Salaries and Expenses of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland."

MR. SEXTON said, he thought it was a matter of regret that the Government had not seen their way to the introduction of a Supplementary Estimate in order to eke out the miserable incomes of the National School teachers of Ireland; and he hoped it might not yet be quite too late for them to reconsider the matter. The National School teachers of Ireland had a powerful claim upon the Government, no matter what Party was in power; but he thought they had a specially powerful claim upon the present Government, for reasons which he would briefly state. Ten years had now elapsed since the right hon. Baronet the Leader of the House procured the passing of a Bill under the provisions of which the Boards of Poor Law Guardians in Ireland were enabled to contribute to the incomes of the National teachers. At the time of the passing of the Bill the right hon. Baronet declared that if the measure were found to be ineffective for this purpose the Government would see that the losses of the teachers were made good in some other way. It was notorious that the Act turned out to be a complete failure. There were 165 Poor Law Unions in Ireland, and he did not suppose that one of them contributed now to the incomes of the National School teachers. In fact, the failure of the Act was so complete that three years after it was passed into law, the Members of the present Government being then in Office, the House of Commons adopted a unanimous Resolution declaring that the condition of the Irish National teachers demanded the immediate attention of the Government. Later on a sum, equal on the average to £4 a-year, was added to the incomes of the teachers; but when they considered the failure—the very natural and justifiable failure—of the Board of Guardians to contribute to the expense of a system over which they had no control, and when they considered also the demands that were made on the incomes of the teachers by the requirements of the pension scheme, he thought it would be admitted by everyone who had paid the least attention to the subject that the condition of the National School teachers in Ireland was, practically, no better now than it was a few years ago, when the House of Commons declared that their condition demanded immediate attention. No doubt, in consequence of the failure of the Board of Guardians, a provision had been adopted whereby a contingent contribution from the result fees was made payable in case of a contribution from any local source. But he was sorry to say that he believed this had turned out to be also a fictitious contribution, and not a substantial provision, because, in many cases, the teachers had been driven to inflate the local contributions, and to represent them to be in excess of what they were, as they had no other way of obtaining contingent contributions. On the whole, the teachers were in the same position as they were when the House declared that their condition required immediate attention. Indeed, the additional contribution to their salaries amounted in 1878 to only 1*s.* 6*d.* per week, and made no material alteration in their position. The National School teachers claimed that their incomes were inadequate to the decent requirements of their condition of life; and they asserted that they were performing work similar to that which was done by teachers in England and Scotland, and done quite as well, while they were receiving not much more than one-half of the remuneration. If they would take the male and female teachers of England, it would be found that the average income was more than £100 a-year. The average income of teachers in Scotland was considerably higher than £100 a-year; while the Irish National School teachers claimed that the average amount of their incomes, from all sources, was not more than £60 a-year. He knew that the Board of National Education had issued a Table of averages which placed the figures higher than that amount; but he would observe that the frequent Tables of averages issued by the Board of National Education on the subject all differed from one another, and only resembled each other in putting the emoluments of the teachers much higher than they actually were. The chief officials of the National Board of Education were very dexterous indeed in the manipulation of figures, and having excellent salaries of their own they were well content to use figures for the purpose of showing, or endeavouring to show, that their humbler subordinates had higher salaries than they really had. Although the middle class schools and others were better cared for, the majority of the principal teachers in Ireland were not getting more for class subjects than 2*s.* 6*d.* a-day, and the assistant teachers derived from the same source about 2*s.* a-day. When he put a Question a few days ago to the right hon. Baronet the Leader of the House, the reply he received was that the Government could not introduce a Supplementary Estimate, because if they were to do so they would prejudice the case. He (Mr. Sexton) failed to see how it would prejudice the case. The case, as far as it regarded the incomes of the teachers, had already been considered by all parties, and he thought that the teachers had a fair right to be judged by the common feeling. Would anyone say that the incomes of the National School teachers were sufficient for the important functions discharged by the teachers, or for the due maintenance of their position in life? He was at a loss to understand what could possibly be meant by prejudicing the case. The late Chancellor of the Duchy (Mr. Trevelyan) had a Bill in his pocket last year which had for its object the augmentation of the incomes of the teachers, and the late Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant (Mr. Campbell-Bannerman) introduced a Bill which he stated would make a considerable addition; and the only reason why that Bill had not been carried forward was the catastrophe which happened to the late Government. Now, it was very hard if a great political event was to be assigned as a reason why a poor, hard-working, and deserving class of public servants were to be left in a position of starvation, and it would only have been generous for the Government to have included in a Supplementary Estimate some special addition to the incomes of the National School teachers which might appease their demands, and deal with the most urgent part of their claim until the whole question could be reconsidered. He was not without hope that the right hon. Gentleman would see his way even now to shadowing forth some better prospect of dealing with the subject than the answer he had given the other day. Not only was there deep discontent throughout Ireland upon this subject, but he thought the hon. Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) would confirm him in the observation that the class of National School teachers in Ireland was daily deteriorating in consequence of the neglect of their demands. Within the last 10 years the Civil Service and other Departments of the Public Service had opened themselves out to the National School teachers; and it was acknowledged by the most experienced Inspectors of the Board of Education that it was difficult, even in a large city like Dublin, to secure proper teachers. Indeed, one Inspector had asserted that the National teachers in his district were more like agricultural labourers than teachers. It was certainly a sad omen for the future that the school teachers were obliged to take to shops and to work small farms, or to go cattle jobbing for the purpose of picking up a living. Every hon. Member would agree with him that pursuits like those, occupying the attention and time of the National School teachers, and drawing them away from their regular pursuits, would tend to the injury of education, and prevent the teachers from resorting to that study and use of their time which would enable them to improve their classification in the service, and thereby tend to promote the general interests of the people. This was an urgent matter. But there was another matter which, in his opinion, was also urgent, and that was that there should be an entire reform in the constitution of the Board of National Education in Ireland. He did not think that there could be found a worse administration in the world. He did not think it possible to organize or imagine a worse administration. It was composed of two elements. The first was the Board itself. The Board was a showy institution, composed of 20 persons of considerable pomp and dignity, most of them officials who had plenty of work to do elsewhere, and who very seldom attended the meetings of the Board. On the Motion of his hon. Friend the Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) a Return was obtained last year which was of a very instructive character. It showed the attendance, up to a certain period, at the meetings of the Board. That Return applied to 20 Commissioners appointed to administer £750,000 of the public money annually for the education of Irish children, and it would be seen that many of those gentlemen very seldom took the trouble to concern themselves with the affairs of the institution. Out of the entire 20 there were only four or five who habitually attended the meetings of the Board. Of course the paid Commissioner was always there, and the paid Commissioner was the soul and essence of the authority of the entire Board. He thought it was highly desirable that the Commissioners should have continued to give information as to the attendance at the meetings of the Board; and he claimed on behalf of the public a right to be informed what Commissioners attended to their duty and what Commissioners neglected it. But this year he was informed that the Commissioners refused any longer to give that information. What right had those gentlemen to apply the principles of the Star Chamber to the administration of education in Ireland? What right had they to go into a room in Marlborough Street and transact their business in the dark? It was necessary that light should be thrown upon their administration, and that the public should receive more satisfaction than the mere whim of the Commissioners for spending £750,000 without affording information as to who took part in the administration. There was something worse behind, because it was not merely the Board who administered the money; but there was within the Board a sort of inner secret *junta*, whose proceedings were never made public. The Board was composed of a paid Commissioner and four subordinates—two secretaries and two chiefs of inspection, and those five gentlemen sat in secret. In regard to their proceedings there was no efficient responsibility whatever, although they had the whole power of the system in their own hands. How had they exercised it? They exercised it in a spirit of petty despotism. Very lately the Inspectors of the National Board had the temerity to bring their grievances under the notice of the House of Commons, whereupon what was called the Commission rebuked them harshly; and, not satisfied with abusing the Inspectors themselves, they got the Lord Lieutenant to do so also. The men had been simple enough to think that it was the right of any citizen, if he thought he was suffering a grievance, to bring the knowledge of it under the notice of Parliament; but, in the opinion of those five well-paid gentlemen who transacted their business in the dark in Marlborough Street, it was a misdemeanour for the Inspectors of the National Board to attempt to instruct the Representatives of the people as to the nature of the grievances they suffered. A still more scandalous and contemptible exercise of authority occurred in the case of the teachers. A couple of years ago, at their annual dinner, the teachers omitted the health of Earl Spencer. They drunk the health of the Queen, and were simple enough to think that, having paid homage to Royalty, they ought not to extend Royal honours even to so exalted a person as the Lord Lieutenant. It appeared that Sir Patrick Keenan conceived in his own brain that there had been an intentional insult to Earl Spencer in omitting to drink the health of the Viceroy, and the result was that a Circular of the most unprecedented character was issued to the teachers. They were warned that penalties of a drastic character would follow any attempt on their part to criticize the proceedings of the Board of Commissioners, and that they would be held responsible personally—which he presumed to mean the loss of their situations—for any language which might be used at any meetings of theirs by Members of the House. He challenged history to furnish a parallel for this act of audacity on the part of the *junta* which sat in secret in Marlborough Street. Not only did they endeavour to chain the minds and curb the tongues of those in their own employment, but they even attempted to impose conditions on Members of the House of Commons, and other persons. But the Irish Members intended to pursue an independent course, altogether regardless of the views of the Commissioners in Marlborough Street, or of any other Public Board in Ireland. He claimed that the Government should consider this question with the view of the Irish Members being told whether the Representatives of the people were to be allowed to confer freely with the National teachers of Ireland, or whether it was seriously intended that those humble men should labour under heavy grievances, and should be debarred from receiving the aid of the advocacy of their Parliamentary Friends by the exercise of cowardly threats thrown out by the Commissioners. There was this curious episode in recent Irish history. Sir Patrick Keenan, the head Commissioner, having congratulated Earl Spencer on the result of his labours in Ireland, was made by the Lord Lieutenant, on the last day he spent in Ireland, a Privy Councillor. So that, as Sir Patrick Keenan had hitherto been enabled to work his will in secret upon the unfortunate National teachers, so henceforth, as a Privy Councillor, he might be at liberty to operate upon the rights and freedom of his countrymen at large. He (Mr. Sexton) had also to complain, with regard to the relations of the Board towards the National teachers, that not only had the Board not exerted itself to improve their condition, but it had actually done all in its power to prevent them from improving that condition by their own industry. The Commissioners had thrown every obstacle in their power in the way of the teachers who endeavoured to obtain employment in other branches of the Public Service. In this connection he had mentioned, the other night, the case of an unfortunate man who was trained in the Marlborough School, but who, relinquishing the teaching profession, took the situation of a prison warder. But what did the Commissioners do? They made an arrangement by which the whole of the £45 which had been spent in his training as a teacher should be deducted from the man's wages at the rate of 5*s*. a-week from the 17*s*. a-week which he received as prison warder. This arbitrary course was pursued simply because the man had gone into another service to find employment, having been unable to obtain it in the profession for which he had been trained. In England no obstacle was interposed in the way of a teacher pursuing any avocation he thought fit out of schools hours; but in Ireland, if a teacher endeavoured to establish a Science and Art class out of school hours, the Commissioners interposed, and the effect was to keep a man who was suffering very extreme poverty idle in the evening when he was willing to use his abilities in the service of the public if he were allowed to do so. What was the meaning of that absurd and cruel restriction? The only way in Ireland in which a teacher could improve his position was by improving his classification, and to do that he must be examined. But before he could be examined the head Inspector and the local Inspector must concur in his application, and must report upon the condition of his school. He did not see why such obstacles should be put in the teacher's way. No doubt, the teacher was not obliged to go up for examination; but if he did, of his own free will, and failed, what was the consequence? The Commissioners reported the fact of the failure to his manager. They did not report the details, nor said what branches of learning he had not succeeded in; but they only said that the answers of the candidate were not of sufficient merit to secure his promotion. So that the consequence of a man presenting himself for examination in order to improve his miserable income was reported to the managers of the school with which he was connected as practically incompetent, and his means of living were placed in jeopardy. He also objected strongly to the system of confidential Reports adopted by the National Board of Ireland. The National Board refused to produce and to lay upon the Table the Reports made by their own Inspectors. The practice of the Star Chamber in the days of Charles I., and the peculiar devices of the Council of Ten in Mediæval Venice, were revived in this Board of to-day. An Inspector reported a teacher for incompetency. The first the teacher heard about it was in a letter from the manager, rebuking him, disrating him, or dismissing him; but he was never allowed to see the Report of the Inspector. The case against him was heard in his absence, and he was condemned in the dark. Even when a Member of the House of Commons moved for such documents his demand was refused on the ground that the Report was confidential. Confidential! A class of officials in the service of the State were allowed to ruin another class at their pleasure, and the injured men were not allowed to see the Reports which had been made against them, because, forsooth, those Reports were held to be confidential! Ten years ago that was not the system in vogue. The Reports were produced then; and he remembered the case of a man named Morris, in which a Report was laid upon the Table. But since the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) went to Ireland, Sir Patrick Keenan and the Commissioners of the National Board appeared to have adopted the worst practices of the right hon. Gentleman. Whenever the right hon. Gentleman threw a man into prison without accusation or trial—whenever he threw a National School teacher into prison, as he had done in some cases—Sir Patrick Keenan and the Commissioners of the National Board immediately dismissed that man from the service of the Board. He knew that in one case a man was dismissed solely on the ground that he had been arrested on suspicion by the hon. Member for Bradford. [Mr. ILLINGWORTH: The right hon. Member for Bradford.] He could understand that the hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. Illingworth) was anxious to relieve himself of the imputation. Of course, it was the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster). Not only was the teacher dismissed from the service of the National Board, but every one of his relatives. The whole family was thrown into a state of penury and destitution; and if that was not unjustifiable and arbitrary tyranny, he did not know what course of proceeding could be properly so described. Would the right hon. Gentleman tell the Committee whether this system of confidential Reports was to be continued, or whether the National teachers in Ireland, who were threatened with the loss of salary and of living, would in future have some opportunity of meeting the charges made against them, just as the worst and basest criminal had in a public Court of Justice? He claimed also that when a teacher failed in his examination his failure should be communicated to himself; and, unless the school manager was anxious to hear about it, the Commissioners should not volunteer information for which the manager did not ask, and which must exercise a damaging influence upon the future position of the man. Until recently—and he was not quite sure that it did not exist at the present moment—the Commissioners prevented a man from obtaining a degree in the University. Some of the members of their own body had obtained degrees; but the Commissioners debarred the teachers from doing so. Why was that? It was because if a man obtained the degree of Bachelor of Arts in a University it would afford evidence of the injustice of the Commissioners if they refused to allow him, on examination, to go into the first class. They did not want any collateral criticism to be brought to bear upon their case; and, therefore, they were anxious to prevent any National School teacher from obtaining a University degree. He knew the case of a teacher who had the misfortune to write a prize essay in *The Freeman's Journal* some time ago on the grievances of the National teachers. It was a most able and temperate paper. He knew the writer to be an able man, and a man of exceptional attainments in classics as well as English; but, because he ventured to criticize the system and expose the grievances of the teachers, what was the fate of that man? He underwent six examinations in order to improve his classification; but he never succeeded in passing beyond the lowest grade of a National teacher, although he was a man who had proved himself to be of a capacity far higher than was requisite to enable him to obtain the highest grade. After many years of fruitless exertions to improve his position, he was at length, by a series of persecutions, driven out of the service of the Board. The Commissioners were not willing that the teachers should obtain University degrees; but they were not unwilling that one of the higher officials of their own body should claim a degree which he had never obtained at all. There was a book called a *Primer of Grammar*, by "Lionel Edwards, Master of Arts." Some of the Inspectors would not allow questions upon grammar to be answered out of any other book, yet would it be believed that that book, which purported to be written by Lionel Edwards, M.A., was written by John Sherer, the Secretary of the Board, who was too modest to give his real name, but tacked to his pseudonym a degree he had never obtained? In the county of Sligo, recently, a teacher named Doyle, an able man whom he had the pleasure of knowing, wished to go to London for the purpose of increasing his efficiency by attending a course of scientific instruction at South Kensington. He wished the Committee to mark the intelligence of the Commissioners. This man wanted to go away for a few months, and he asked for leave to appoint a substitute. Their answer was—"No, you cannot appoint a substitute; but a teacher must resign if he wants to go to London, and a new teacher must be appointed in his place." The teacher gave way and resigned, and a new teacher was appointed. The new teacher resigned very soon afterwards, and the manager was placed in this position—he had either to close the school altogether, to the great loss of the children, or else to appoint a monitor. He appointed a monitor, who discharged the duties well; but when the principal teacher returned from London he was allowed to resume charge of the school; but the Commissioners actually refused to recognize as part of the school time of the year the period during which the monitor was in charge. The Commissioners said that the manager had no right to appoint a monitor, and that there was a rule that a manager should not dismiss a teacher without three months' notice. It was alleged that this clause was intended for the protection of the teacher, and that it was a reason why the time during which the school was in charge of a monitor should not be allowed. He was informed that the Commissioners had retreated from the position they took up on that question; but he would like to know from the right hon. Gentleman whether, in future, a teacher who wished to come to London in order to obtain instruction in science would be allowed to do so without any impediment being thrown in his way? He also wished to inquire whether the time in an English school during which a monitor occupied the position of principal teacher would be allowed in the school-time of the year, because the children would otherwise be prevented from obtaining the results of the examination, and the income of the year would be diminished. Another great objection, and, indeed, his principal objection, to the system, was that the Board had a strict monopoly in the preparation and sale of school books. They compiled an edition, published it, and sold it; they kept shops and a depôt for the sale of their school books; and, in point of fact, instead of allowing free trade, they exercised a strict monopoly against the rights of private enterprize, and also against the interests of education. The result was that the Commissioners issued an antiquated set of class books in which they completely ignored the history, biography, and literature of Ireland. Their geography and history extended only to Palestine and the Old Testament, and they would not allow any reference in their books to famous scenes of Irish history, because they might, perhaps, include something that was not in accordance with the sentiments of the English Government. He should have supposed that in all civilized nations the history of the country itself would furnish one of the landmarks of education. Even Sir Patrick Keenan himself had reported formerly in favour of incorporating Irish history in the National school books; but he said nothing about that now. Sir Patrick Keenan, in the interests of education, visited various countries in order to make inquiries, and he had reported upon the propriety of teaching the native language in the schools of Malta and Trinidad. For one of his Reports he was made a C.B., and for another he was knighted. All references to the National religion were studiously avoided in the class books. Perhaps that was accounted for by the fact that one of the members of the Board of Education of Ireland was a gentleman who was formerly a street preacher against Catholicity, and who was in the habit of disturbing the public peace at the Custom House of Dublin by occupying the public pathway. He had said that the Board ignored the language and literature of Ireland; but what would the Committee think of this? About 20 years ago the Board revised one of their books, and in the new edition printed an account of the death of Queen Philippa from *Froissart's Chronicles*. Somebody, however, took exception to it, and thereupon it was cut out. So also in regard to the beautiful poem written by one of the Irish National poets, Samuel Lover. Because a fisherman's wife saw a baby smiling, and said that an angel was whispering to it, the sentiment was considered intolerable, as also was another which spoke of the woman "numbering her beads." The Commissioners cut out also the Canadian boat song of Thomas Moore because it contained a prayer to St. Anne. Why should not the sale of those books be thrown open to national competition? If a veto was to be exercised let it be exercised by some sensible person. The books now in use were as suitable to Kamschatka as to Ireland. They contained nothing of the genius, or the nature, or the soul of the people. All the gems of Irish literature were left out because they happened to contain reference to some famous Irish personage; and, as he had intimated, all reference to scenes that were famous in Irish history were ignored, because it was suspected they might not be quite agreeable to the sentiments of the English Government. If the preparation of those books was thrown open to public competition the publishers in Ireland would have a fair chance, and their ingenuity would be brought to bear in providing books more suitable to the present times, and to the requirements of the present age; and if a veto were lodged in the hands of some sensible person there would be no danger that any unsuitable facts would be allowed to creep into such books. Before he sat down he was desirous of making an appeal to the right hon. Gentleman on the subject of the Irish language. The Commissioners of National Education had done no worse turn to Ireland than in their treatment of the Irish language. There were at the present moment in Ireland about 300,000 persons, or nearly one-third of a million, either of school-going age, or coming up to it, whose native tongue and language were Irish. Sir Patrick Keenan had pointed out, in former days, that the only intelligent way of teaching English to an Irish-speaking person was to teach him first the grammar of the Irish tongue, and then, by the use of that tongue, to teach him the grammar and meaning of English. Some time ago, in a school in the county of Donegal most of the pupils lived in a bog, and every morning when they went to school they carried sods of turf to light the school fire. They read the English lessons glibly; but having examined them personally in order to ascertain what they really knew he found that they did not know what the meaning of the word "bog" was. What was the use of teaching children anything in that parrot light when a few months spent in teaching them Irish would give them the grip of corresponding words in the English language? Hitherto the Irish children had never received those advantages, and he held that the Commissioners of the National Board of Education had done great wrong to the children by excluding the teaching of the Irish tongue. Within the last generation 3,000,000 of poor people had emigrated from Ireland.

Most of them had passed through the National Schools of the country. Of those 3,000,000 he could say, with regard to 1,000,000 of them, at least, that Irish was the language of their homes; and if a rational method had been adopted of teaching them first the grammar of Irish, and then having the English language explained to them through the native tongue, they would have gone to a foreign land with something like a knowledge of their native tongue, and a practical knowledge of English. But in consequence of the stupidity of the National Board of Education those unfortunate persons would pass their lives and go down to their graves after a struggle in a foreign country without either a literary command of their own vernacular or a practical knowledge of English. They were compelled to go through life heavily handicapped in consequence of that fundamental defect in their education; and it was owing to that vicious system that the unfortunate Irish emigrants to other countries had been condemned to become hewers of wood, and drawers of water, earning the lowest wages, and suffering the extremest poverty. It was not too late to remedy all that. He claimed that in the Training College now existing in Marlborough Street, and in any extension which the Government carried out of the system of Training Colleges in the various Provinces of Ireland, there should be established a Chair of Irish; that the teachers should be taught the native tongue, and that the native tongue should be made part of the Irish curriculum, so that teachers who went to teach in parts of the country where Irish was the language spoken should be competent to give instruction in that tongue. He was able to say, from his own experience, that large numbers of the people of Ireland still spoke the native language. In his native county of Waterford 38 per cent of the people, and in the county of Clare, in which the constituency he represented was placed, 54 per cent of the people spoke the Irish language. On the West Coast of Ireland four-fifths of 1,000,000 spoke Irish. It was not yet too late to make some provision for the children of those people. Let them be taught rationally as children were taught at Malta and Trinidad. Give them a fair modicum of the grammar of their own tongue, and as they acquired knowledge of that tongue explain and fasten in their minds the meaning of English. They would never arrive at a satisfactory conclusion otherwise, and they would never make the teaching of the National Board as valuable as it ought to be for the instruction of that class of the Irish people. He felt so strongly upon the question of the monopoly now existing in regard to the preparation and sale of class-books that were utterly unsuitable in Ireland, and marred by every conceivable defect which it was possible for class-books to have, that he would move the reduction of the Vote by the sum of £37,150, that being the amount of the Vote for the Book Department. The time had come when that monopoly must be discontinued. The preparation and sale of school books must be thrown open in Ireland, as they were at that moment in Great Britain, to the skill and literary culture of men who desired to be employed in that branch of literature. The trade must be no longer hampered by retaining that monopoly in the hands of the National Board. He thought he had now outlined several matters in which reform was urgently needed; but he would conclude his remarks by saying that no adequate reform would be carried into effect so long as the present system of retaining an irresponsible *junta* was allowed to exist in Ireland. When the Irish Party had a controlling influence in Irish affairs, and when her Press had fair play, they would soon see the substitution of a Board of Education of a really representative character, instead of one which was mainly distinguished by its irresponsibility and partizanship.

The CHAIRMAN asked where the item was to be found which the hon. Member desired to omit?

Mr. SEXTON said, it would be found on page 400.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the item of £37,150 be omitted from the proposed Vote."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Mr. MELDON said, he wished to offer a few observations on a subject connected with the educational interests of Ireland—he referred to the condition of the teachers in the primary schools. That question had been brought under the attention of the House as far back as 1875. He knew that the subject was a large one, and that in the interval many matters had crept up which had rendered the settlement of the question then offered totally unacceptable now as a final settlement. But he did not propose to deal now with the larger state of affairs. The position he took up at the present time—which he thought was a most opportune time—was this—that the pledges given by the Conservative Government at that date—pledges given by the right hon. Gentleman the present Leader of the House—should be fulfilled, and not allowed, as they had been, to remain in abeyance. What was the state of affairs in 1875? A complaint was made on the part of those interested in education in Ireland that the condition of the teachers of the National Schools was such as not only to be a disgrace to the country, but unjust to the people who were called on to teach. There were three grievances brought forward—first, that the salaries paid were totally insufficient; secondly, that they were called on to do their work without any residences being provided for them, and it was pointed out that many of the teachers had to walk from six to 12 miles a-day, coming and going——

THE CHAIRMAN wished to point out to the hon. and learned Member that he would have to connect his speech with the item now before the Committee, or to wait until the Amendment was disposed of, when he would be able to speak upon the general question. It would not be in Order to discuss the general question of education on the Motion now before the Committee for the omission of a certain item.

MR. MELDON asked if he was to understand that the discussion must be confined to the item for the preparation and sale of books?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. If the hon. and learned Gentleman will connect his speech to that item he will be quite in Order. Strictly speaking, the Committee are now discussing the item for books.

MR. MELDON said, he did not propose to trouble the Committee with any observations solely confined to the question of books; and, therefore, he would take another opportunity for discussing the Vote.

MR. SEXTON said, he would withdraw his Motion for the present, so as to allow the general question to be discussed.

THE CHAIRMAN: That will be the most convenient course if the general question is to be discussed.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn*.

Original Question again proposed.

MR. MELDON said, he had been remarking that there were three questions brought under the consideration of the House in 1875; the first was the salaries of the teachers; secondly, their having no residences, for it was proved that 80 per cent had no residence provided for them from any source except their own; and, thirdly, that there was no system of retiring pensions for the teachers, when old age or infirmity obliged the teachers to give up their teaching duties. Upon those three heads the then Chief Secretary for Ireland and the present Leader of the House distinctly admitted that the grievance was proved; and he must take the opportunity of saying that the right hon. Gentleman met that demand then made in the fairest and most open way he could do. As long as the right hon. Gentleman remained in Office he did the utmost in his power to apply such remedies as he was permitted to avail himself of. There was but one feeling among the body of teachers in Ireland, and also among the people generally—that the right hon. Gentleman deserved every credit that could possibly be given to him for his action in the matter. He (Mr. Meldon) had no wish to detain the Committee at any length, and therefore he would pass over many of the details; but the matter culminated in an admission that those three grievances had been proved, and an undertaking was given that a remedy would forthwith be applied. In accordance with that undertaking the right hon. Baronet introduced a Bill called the "Teachers Bill," in 1875. He introduced another Bill which dealt with the question of residences, and a substantial increase was made to the Estimates of 1875 in order to fulfil the promises he had given. Now, what were the remedies of the right hon. Gentleman? In the first place, he added a sum of something like £60,000 a-year to the class salaries of the teachers, which amounted to an average of £75 per head unconditionally added to the salaries of the teachers, male and female. He also took a Vote for an additional £60,000 to be added to the remuneration of the teachers by way of result fees. When the National Teachers' Bill was brought in it provided that the Boards of Guardians should be at liberty, if they thought fit, to provide a further sum of £60,000 to be applied towards the payment of one-third of the result fees to be earned by the tenants. An additional sum of £60,000 was therefore taken in the Estimates to be paid to those teachers who could induce the Boards of Guardians to contribute to the results fees. The way, therefore, in which the matter stood was this—£60,000 were added to the class salaries unconditionally out of the Estimates; £60,000 estimated to pay one-third of the results fees the teachers might earn were also given unconditionally; and another £60,000 were taken in the Estimates conditionally, in order that that amount might be applied in paying another third of the results fees in case the Boards of Guardians were willing to contribute the remaining third. It was pointed out at the time in the House of Commons by those who advocated the claims of the teachers that the Bill would be practically inoperative, and really no solution of the question whatever. The then Chief Secretary stated that the Bill was only a tentative one, and in the concluding part of his speech he pledged the Government to a reconsideration of the case in the next Session of Parliament if the Bill did not work in the way in which it was expected to work. That pledge was given most distinctly, and was reiterated over and over again, and in the year 1875 the then Conservative Government and the House were pledged, if that Bill failed, to make some other provision to secure to the teachers the remuneration they were entitled to. From that time down to the present the pledge remained entirely unfulfilled, notwithstanding that every effort had been made to induce not only the last Government, but the Government which preceded it, to fulfil it. What had taken place? The National Teachers' Act of 1875 having failed, the matter was brought again under the notice of the House, and the Chief Secretary stated that he fully admitted that the Act had failed, and that a remedy ought immediately to be applied. That was in 1876. But still nothing whatever was done. The Government were pressed year after year to fulfil the pledges given by them in 1875 and 1876; but for some reason or other they neglected to do so, and what had been the result? In 1878, as those pledges remained unfulfilled, it became, unfortunately, his duty to call the attention of the House, in a more hostile spirit than he cared to do, to those repeated breaches of faith—not only the Government, but the House being pledged to redeem the promise. The Resolution which was moved on the 7th of May, 1878, was to the following effect:—

> "That 'The National School Teachers (Ireland) Act (1875)' and the other means adopted by the Government having failed to satisfy the just demands of the Irish National School Teachers, this House is of opinion that the present position of the Irish National School Teachers, and the discontent which prevails amongst that important body of public servants, calls for the immediate attention of Her Majesty's Government, with a view to a satisfactory adjustment of their claims."

That was the Resolution which he had moved, and which was directed against the Conservative Government of that day. And what was the result? The then Chief Secretary (Mr. J. Lowther) objected to that Resolution, although the case brought forward was overwhelming, and took on himself to move an Amendment to leave out the words referring to the discontent which prevailed, in order to insert the words "calls for the immediate attention of Her Majesty's Government." With the unanimous assent of the House the following Resolution was passed:—

> "That 'The National School Teachers (Ireland) Act, 1875,' and the other means adopted by the Government, having failed to satisfy the just demands of the Irish National School Teachers, this House is of opinion that the present position of the Irish National School Teachers calls for the immediate attention of Her Majesty's Government, with a view to a satisfactory adjustment of their claims."

Since that day, up to the present time, not a single step had been taken to increase the salaries of the National School teachers, or to improve their position in respect of their salaries, except granting one sum to them, to which he proposed to call attention presently. What was their position with respect to salary at the present moment? All he asked for was that the pledge given in 1876 upon this question of salary should be carried out. He had no wish to go into the general question at all; but he merely desired now to ask that the pledge given in 1875 by the then Conservative Government, repeated in 1876, and affirmed by the Resolution passed by the House in 1878, should be carried out. The result had been that the Act of 1875 had become practically useless and inoperative. Boards of Guardians in a few instances had become contributors; but the great body of teachers had lost a third of the result fees intended to be provided by the scheme of 1875. They were, indeed, also very nearly losing another third intended to be provided for them; but by an arrangement that local contributions should be counted as contributions by the Guardians, this second part was, to a great extent, secured. There had, however, been an absolute loss to them from 1875 to the present of one-third of the result fees earned by them from year to year. What an overwhelming case, then, had the teachers in favour of their claims. The statements he had made could not be controverted; it had been admitted all through, and never denied, that what the teachers were seeking they should have; but they had been put off from day to day. The question now was, could anything practical be done to give them temporary relief? That could be done in two ways. First, it might be done in the manner suggested by his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), by a Supplementary Estimate being now brought in to meet the difficulty in the present year, so that teachers should not suffer further loss from the indisposition to redeem pledges made so long ago. That was a simple way of doing it; but there was another way quite as easy, and one that, if the Treasury would not come to the assistance of the cause of education in Ireland, ought to be adopted. Not only did the last Conservative Government give promises, but the late Government, over and over again, promised to introduce a Bill to carry out the compact of 1875. For some reason he did not care to inquire into at the present time, their pledges remained unfulfilled until the present Session, when the late Government introduced a Bill which, according to their ideas, did carry out the pledge given by their Predecessors and by themselves on several occasions. One part of that Bill proposed to make it compulsory on Unions to make the contributions it was intended they should make in 1875. If that had been done seven years ago, so far as the salaries were concerned, the pledges of 1875 would have been redeemed. In 1875 it was suggested that instead of the Bill being voluntary on Unions it should be made compulsory; and it was suggested to the then Chief Secretary for Ireland that if a rate of a National character were imposed by the Bill, teachers would have been secured to the full extent, not to what they were entitled, but to what they were promised in 1875. But for some reason or other the idea was not adoptod, nor was the Bill made compulsory upon Unions. The late Government did introduce in their Bill a provision making it compulsory upon Unions to make contributions, and they provided for the raising of such by a National rate. Unfortunately, the Bill however did not, in his opinion, carry out the pledges of 1875, and for this reason—it introduced many provisions of a controversial character; it contained many matters which were mixed up with thé promises made in 1875. But now what could be done? The Bill introduced by the late Government might be taken up by the present Government and passed into law this Session, omitting everything from it save that the contributions of the Unions promised in 1875 should be made compulsory. He could see no difficulty in that course, and it would carry out the promise of 1875. There were then two different ways of fulfilling those pledges—by the Treasury coming forward with a Supplementary grant, or by carrying on the Bill cut down to the proposal to make contributions from the rates compulsory. He did not see why this last course should not be followed, for he observed that the Bill introduced by the late Government had no hostile Notices against it, and, so far as he knew, it was not opposed on that side of the House. He did not wish to occupy the time of the Committee further. He had pointed out how pledges were made, how Parliament was pledged and successive Governments were pledged, and how those pledges, up to the present, remained unfulfilled. One other matter he should call attention to, for it might be said that, subsequent to the Resolution of 1878 of the House of Commons, something had been done, for £40,000 a-year had been added to the salaries of class teachers since then. But the object of that was not to increase the salaries of the teachers, but it was part and parcel of the pension scheme by which a nucleus was to be formed, the teachers being required to make contributions to entitle them to pensions. It was pointed out how impossible it was for them to do so from their miserable meagre salaries, so this sum of £40,000 was allowed as part of the pension scheme, however not in redemption of the pledges of 1875. He contended that the full results fees promised in 1875 should be secured to the teachers for this year, leaving the larger question open for settlement hereafter. That should be done either by a grant or by a rate, general, or imposed by each Union. The pension scheme he had mentioned was of this nature—a large sum from the Church Surplus was allocated as a nucleus to form a Pension Fund, and teachers were required to make annual contributions to that Fund until they received a pension. The age at which a teacher was entitled to a pension was 65, and they usually entered the service at an early age—17 or 18; and that meant that the vast majority obtained no pensions at all; and those who reached the age of 65 enjoyed their pensions for a very short time. It had turned out that the sum allocated to form the nucleus for the Fund was far more than sufficient, according to actuarial calculations, to afford pensions at a much earlier age. Of course, he would not now enter fully into that point; but he would direct the attention of the Chief Secretary to it, and the gross injustice of fixing the pension age at 65. No matter how long teachers had been in the service—40 years, or 20 years, or less—they all received exactly the same pension, which depended not upon length of service, but upon the ability of a man or woman to live for a certain time. Nothing more absurd in relation to a pension scheme could be found. The scheme was worthless. A great number of teachers dropped off, unable to keep in the service to the age fixed; and if the scheme were not amended it would be of little or no use. It should be remembered that the teachers were themselves giving large contributions towards pensions. He would suggest that the retiring age for men be fixed at 55, and of women at 50, length of service being taken into account. Another question was that of residences. The gross injustice in not providing teachers' residences was admitted in 1875. Every speaker who addressed the House in the debate on that occasion admitted the hardship to teachers and injury to the cause of education by not having teachers properly housed. It was pointed out that no grant was made unless the school house was in good condition and well fitted; and it was maintained that suitable teachers' residences were equally necessary; and it was calculated that £5,000 would be required. A scheme was then prepared by which loans should be granted for the erection of teachers' residences; that the money to build should be advanced at the rate of 5 per cent, repayable, principal and interest, in 25 years, half of the interest to be paid by money voted by Parliament. The sum of £5,000, for one year, was voted in 1875. It was a very fair, a liberal offer, and had the plan been properly worked would have been satisfactory; but, in the result, not a single farthing of the £5,000 voted by the House for the erection of dwellings for teachers had been expended. The next year £2,500 was voted, and none of that expended, and so it dwindled down to £500 being taken for the purpose. In the result, now, a little over £1,000 a-year was annually paid in annuities after the Act had been in work for 10 years. In point of fact, the entire Act had been inoperative. Something, he thought, should be done. The original scheme was a good one, and he would suggest that the Board of Education should be empowered to make it compulsory that residences should be provided, except in very exceptional cases, just as they insisted on a proper school house and fittings being provided. Unless something of that kind were done teachers would be left precisely in the same position they were in in 1875 so far as residences were concerned. He had omitted details in connection with this subject; he had merely pointed out the circumstances; he had shown that promises remained unfulfilled—promises not only of successive Governments, but of the House. And what had been going on these 10 years? He would venture to say, an enormous amount of mischief had been done to the cause of education by reason of the grievances of the National teachers being left so long in abeyance. They had been forced to agitate year after year. A more exemplary body of men, who conducted their agitation for years with the utmost moderation, could not be found; and it had been productive of the utmost mischief, that it had been proved to those men that they might agitate as long as they liked, in a moderate manner, without having their just and admitted grievances redressed. The class of teachers entering the service was much inferior to what it was; they had lost hope in having anything done for them after these repeated breaches of faith. The agitation of 10 years had done more to injure education than anything else in the period. He hoped he had put forward these views with moderation. He complained of a breach of faith; he had called attention to the fact that the last Conservative Government deserved a large amount of credit for what they had done and what they promised, and their promises they were bound in honour to carry out. He had pointed out two ways in which that could be done without the slightest difficulty, or the necessity for lengthened consideration; the question had been fully considered; and he now asked that effect should be given to the decision arrived at. He wished to guard himself by saying that he did not consider that the fulfilment of the pledges given would be a final settlement of the entire question. He abstained from going into the general question; he confined himself to the pledges given to himself personally and publicly in the House; and upon those points it was fair to press, leaving others to press for a final settlement of the larger question that must undoubtedly be dealt with without very much delay.

MR. SYNAN said, the cause of the National teachers in Ireland had not only the sympathy and the support of every Irish Member in that House; but speaking at that moment, and even at that stage of the Session, he thought that it was due to Irish Members, considering the progress that had been made, that a practical solution of the question ought to be brought about within the short time before them. The hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) had proposed to the Committee two remedies for the grievances of the National teachers. The first was a Supplementary Estimate; and the second was that the Government should proceed with the Bill brought in by the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland under the late Government. Now, he thought that if the hon. and learned Member for Kildare was aware of the state of public opinion, and he (Mr. Synan) had a share in that public opinion, he would have arrived at the conclusion that this second remedy would be of a contentious character, and, as such, that it would be likely to occupy the time of the House for a longer period than was now at the disposal of hon. Members; and therefore he looked upon the suggestion, coming at that stage of the Session, as not a practicable remedy for the grievances of the Irish National teachers. Now, with the first proposed remedy, that of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) that the Government should bring in a Supplementary Estimate, he quite agreed. It altogether rested with Her Majesty's Government to say yes or no to that proposal. Would they bring in a Supplementary Estimate to meet the grievance of the deficiency in the salaries of the Irish National teachers, and to carry out in practice the promise made in 1875, the Resolution of 1878, and, in fact, to offer another remedy for that offered by the late Government? Now, it certainly appeared to him that if Her Majesty's Government was as anxious to serve the Irish National teachers as they professed to be in the years 1875 and 1878, and as the late Government promised when they brought in the Bill of last Session, they would meet with no real opposition in carrying out the proposal. He did not think that the Government would meet with opposition from any section of hon. Members, whether Irish or English, to the introduction of a Supplementary Estimate; and if they were to adopt that course they could then leave it to the new constituencies to apply a permanent remedy to the lamentable state of things which was admitted to exist with respect to the Irish National teachers. If the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary (Sir William Hart Dyke) made himself acquainted with the condition of public opinion in Ireland, and with the condition of the Irish National teachers, he apprehended that the right hon. Gentleman would find no difficulty in bringing in a Supplementary Estimate for £40,000 for the purpose of increasing the salaries of that deserving class of persons. What was the condition of affairs that had resulted from the position in which the Irish National teachers were placed with regard to their salaries? Why, the truth was that the service was being starved. Teachers of the first and second class were disappearing; and the teachers of the present day were men of the third class. The salary of those teachers was only £35 a-year, supplemented by some results fees; in other words, their salary was about equal to the income of an agricultural labourer in Ireland. If it were true that that state of things existed, and it had been admitted, he did not see that there was any practical difficulty in the way of setting it right temporarily by the introduction of a Supplementary Estimate; but to talk of carrying through Parliament a contentious Bill at that stage of the Session was, to his mind, to suggest a means of dealing with a pressing grievance both clumsy and impracticable. There were other matters connected with the subject before the Committee which were also capable of explanation and of a remedy being applied to them. The hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) had referred to the question of residence. Why was it that the measure that proposed to deal with that subject had proved impracticable? To his mind, for no other reason than that the interest on the loans was not low enough, and that the time fixed for the repayment of the money was not long enough. If the rate of interest were reduced, and the time for repayment extended, he was convinced that there would be no necessity for the compulsory Bill suggested by the hon. and learned Member for Kildare. To make every manager in Ireland provide not only a schoolhouse, but a residence for the teacher also, was a thing that could not be done; because if a manager were obliged to pay the present rate of interest demanded by the Government for the money advanced for the purpose, he would not build any schoolhouse or residence at all, and the cause of education would suffer on that account. Managers were of two classes. A manager might be a proprietor who built a schoolhouse for the benefit of the locality; but generally managers were clergymen of parishes, who built schoolhouses out of the doles of their poor parishioners; and would hon. Members think of making it compulsory upon those persons who built schoolhouses to build residences also with money borrowed at the high rate of interest charged by the Government? The teacher himself could not pay the rent of his residence, considering the miserable salary which he at present received. He would now turn to the teachers themselves. How many National teachers were there? The Report said there were of the first class 115, of the second first class 319, of the second class 1,611, and of the third class 1,747. That statement disclosed the fact that the education of the people of Ireland at that moment was committed to teachers almost entirely of the third class, whose salaries were £35 a-year, supplemented, as he had said before, by fees which brought them up to £50 or £60 a-year. He appealed to the Committee to say whether for that money it was possible to get men properly to superintend the education of the people in Ireland? What was the reason why the Irish National teachers were not placed as nearly as possible on the same footing as the English teachers? They did not want to be placed on as high a level; but he contended that they ought to be placed on a level approximating to that of the English teachers. The Government said that the people would not pay for the purpose of supplementing the salary and results fees; but the answer of the Boards of Guardians to that statement was—"We will not pay as long as the system remains as it is; we have no voice in the matter, and no superintendence is allowed us." He (Mr. Synan) failed to find any answer to that complaint on the part of the Boards of Guardians in Ireland; and if the system were altered, if the Guardians were allowed a voice in the administration of the schools, what would become of the Education Board in Ireland, against which complaint was made by the hon. Member for Sligo? Why, that must be altered too. The system must be made a popular system; and if they did not wish to make it a popular system, the Government must take the whole responsibility on their own shoulders. He told the Irish Government that they must make the salaries of the Irish National teachers sufficient for the purpose, and that neither the Irish people nor their Representatives would tolerate that those teachers should be starved in order to serve the ideas of the Government. He said it was for the Irish Government, through the mouth of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, to tell the Committee whether they meant to apply to the present state of things the only remedy at hand—namely, to introduce a Supplementary Estimate. He did not say that the present Government was more responsible for the state of things than their Predecessors in Office; but, connecting them with the Government of 1874-80, they were responsible for it; and he said that the Government which came into Office in 1880, and which remained in Office until recently, had their share of the responsibility also, because they had not provided any remedy. There were other matters connected with this question of a subsidiary character, to which it was the duty of Irish Members to draw the attention of the Government. A set of schools existed in Ireland called Model Schools. They were schools of a secular character, which, like the Queen's Colleges, the Catholic population avoided. Upon those Model Schools the Government spent £40,000 a-year; and, under the circumstances described, he asked why those schools should not be closed and the money applied to increase the salaries of the National School teachers in Ireland? That appeared to him to be a most practical remedy. The Government ought to have made up their minds on this question long ago, for it was a burning question, and had been so during the 20 years he had been in that House; and yet the Government, just as in the case of the Queen's Colleges, insisted on retaining a system at variance with the national wish—a system which seemed to be established for the purpose of proselytism. He gave no opinion upon that; but he asked why the Irish people should not have their children taught at public schools and at the public expense, and why the Government should keep up the present system, and, at the same time, impose on the people of Ireland a class of teachers utterly unfitted for the work to be done by reason of the miserable salaries that were given? What answer had the Government given, and what answer would it give, to the question—"How can the work of public education be conducted on such principles as these?" He was sorry not to see the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary in his place, for he hoped he would answer those points fully and sufficiently. He trusted that, as soon as might be convenient to him, and as soon as he had made up his mind, he would give Irish Members an answer to the question—"Are these miserable salaries to be increased by means of a Supplementary Estimate or not?" To look for any other remedy at that stage of the Session was useless. It would be for a future Parliament to propose a permanent remedy; but he asked Her Majesty's Government, in the meantime, to introduce, for temporary purposes, a Supplementary Estimate, which he felt convinced would pass without opposition or objection.

MR. MARUM said, he would not again go over the ground so ably traversed by his hon. Friends who had spoken on this subject. He wished, however, to allude to some points in the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon). He would not now enter into the question of the Bill to which his hon. and learned Friend had referred, because it was impossible that it could now be passed through Parliament; but he would touch upon two points in connection with it, as it had been said that he and some hon. Friends had not acquiesced in it. It was not that they objected to compulsory attendance; but if the present Government remained in Office they would have to take into consideration what he was about to say. The first point he wished to refer to had reference to compulsory attendance. The present condition of matters with regard to the schools was this—that the managers were really absolute in their authority at present, and their position was so far absolute that they could dispense with a school if they were not satisfied with the regulations. Now, the Government proposed to make it compulsory that there should be attendance. They were going to deprive them of their power, and give them an equivalent to the extent of having a one-third voice in the regulations, the Local Government Board having power, in case of dispute, of taking the matter into their own hands. He believed that the view taken by the managers was that the Government ought not to have any undue power over the education of the country—that was what he believed they most distinctly objected to. They did not object merely from an ecclesiastical point of view; but they objected also on the authority of two laymen, whose authority he believed would not be questioned in that House. Edmund Burke expressed himself to the effect that—

> "If you consent to put the national education, or any part of it, under the control of the Government, then you will have sold your religion."

And Mr. John Stuart Mill also wrote to the effect that it was not right that the Government should have control of the education of the people, because, in that case, they could do whatever they pleased. He wished Her Majesty's Government to bear in mind the views of those men in dealing with compulsory attendance. The next point was the system of payment by results. It was assumed that it would be satisfactory to the people of Ireland, the teachers, and the ratepayers, to make the Unions contributory under the results system. He begged leave to contradict that idea. In support of that he referred to the Resolution passed at the meeting of teachers at Norwich, and the result of the meeting, which had caused considerable interest in this country as well as in Ireland. The system of payment by results was condemned at that meeting. And then Max Müller said that examinations were the means of ascertaining how the teachers had taught; but they should never be allowed to become the means by which pupils were taught, and that the proper rewards at examinations should be honours, not pounds, shillings, and pence. It would be seen that those authorities were altogether against the system of payment by results. Now, the position of the Bishops in this matter was that they would not submit to the dictation of the laity. The whole truth with regard to the support which the Bishops had given to the results system was that they wished to get rid of denominational endowments, and if it were not for that they would have agreed with the views of Max Müller. The views of Cardinal Moran were that the result system was designed as a subterfuge, and in order to get rid of the objection there was to denominational endowments. Now, with regard to making the payment for results compulsory, that must unquestionably be opposed to the feeling of the ratepayers and to that of the people of Ireland. In his own county (Kilkenny) the Boards of Guardians had expressed views hostile to making the Unions contributory; and not only that, but they had referred to the strong agitation which would arise, if the Unions were made contributory, on the ground of increased taxation and the depressed state of trade. He mentioned those facts lest there should be any misapprehension in the minds of the Government with regard to the opinion of the people of Ireland being in favour of the system of payment by results, and he could assure them that the system was neither in accordance with the wishes of the people nor with the wishes of the teachers themselves. Finally, he urged on Her Majesty's Government to take into consideration what had been urged on those Benches—namely, the proposal that they should introduce a Supplementary Estimate for the present, leaving the matters which had been alluded to for future discussion in a new Parliament.

Mr. DAWSON said, he was glad that the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary was present to have his attention directed to one of the great blots on the educational system in Ireland. It was in that sense that the hon. Member for the County of Limerick (Mr. Synan) had alluded to the Model Schools. Now, of all the serious blots on the Irish educational system the erection and continuance of Model Schools was perhaps the most flagrant. The Committee would be aware that the entire educational system of Ireland was denominational. The National Schools were under the management of clergymen of various denominations, and the National Schools of Ireland, which represented all the Catholic population, were without exception denominational. And yet the Government persisted in establishing a number of unnecessary schools or Model Schools which were not put under the management of the clergy of any Church, but under the authority of an Irish Board called an Education Board. The position of those schools was that Catholic priests could not enter their doors. The schools had cost, as he was informed, £168,000 for their construction, and besides that they cost the country every year £36,000, and that too at a time when, as last night, Irish Members were asking for a miserable sum in aid of a popular Irish University which was refused. The Government, with wonderful inconsistency, continued to force upon the Irish people this enormous yearly grant. Of the population of Ireland, 75 per cent was Catholic, and 25 per cent belonged to other denominations. What was the state of things with regard to the attendance at the model schools? For five consecutive years he had endeavoured to point out this blot in the Irish educational system. Those schools, which cost £168,000 to build, and an enormous sum annually to maintain, had only 11,000 pupils, and out of that number there were only 3,198 Catholics, so that while 75 per cent of the people of Ireland were Catholics, only about 25 per cent of the pupils at the model schools were Catholics. The matter, however, did not end there, as hon. Members would see when he told them for what class of the people those schools were provided. He had moved for a Return of the profession and calling of the parents of the few children who attended the model schools, and he found that out of the 11,000 pupils, 4,500 were the sons of agents, grocers, apothecaries, Civil Service *employés*, merchants, attorneys, and others. So that in addition to the schools being forced upon the people against their will, in addition to the miserable attendance of Catholics, there were 4,000 or 5,000 pupils receiving gratuitous education whose parents were perfectly well able to pay for it themselves. Then, in addition to those extraordinary statistics with regard to the model schools, he would refer to the Report of a Commission which was appointed to inquire into the work that was done in them. If it could be maintained that they were extensively used, if it could be proved that the children of the Catholic population generally went to them, and if it could be shown that they had achieved anything in the way of results, the case would be different. However, lest it should be said that they were doing splendidly in the matter of education, he would inform the Committee that the Commission he had alluded to, after taking a considerable amount of evidence, reported that not only did the schools cost at the rate of £5 per head of the pupils, but that their literary teaching was not up to the mark. It was proved before the Commission that carriages drove up to the doors of the schools. Sir Patrick Keenan gave evidence against them, and the Commission reported that they ought to be shut up; but, notwithstanding that, for 20 years the Government had continued to force on the people of Ireland £36,000 a-year for those schools, which, after costing £168,000 to build, were doing nothing whatever. Now, the question had been asked as to what could be done with the schools? The hon. Member for the county of Limerick (Mr. Synan) had suggested that the funds spent upon them should be handed over in aid of the salaries of the National teachers. He (Mr. Dawson) had in the year 1880 proposed that those useless model schools should be turned into schools for the technical education of teachers. He laid that proposal before the present Government, and asked the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary to look at the uselessness of those schools, their utter inadequacy and incompetency, and to say that they should be turned into normal schools for the technical instruction of teachers. There was one of those schools in Limerick perfectly empty, with a large and expensive staff, and his advice was that it should be turned into an institution for the purpose he had described, particularly as in Limerick there was great need of competent teachers. The figures he had laid before the Committee showed how small a number of pupils were instructed for this enormons outlay, and that out of that money a vast proportion went for the education of a class who were never intended to take advantage of the grant. He would ask that this blot which had been pointed out should be removed, and he asked the Committee, the English people, and the House of Commons to apply the moral to be learnt from the discussion of last night and to-day. Let not the Government continue to force upon the Irish people an institution opposed to their wishes. He hoped that the right hon. Gentleman was alive to the extraordinary anomaly of those model schools, to the fact that they could not be sustained by argument, and that the subject should be inquired into, with the view of the system being put an end to.

Mr. MARUM said, he might, perhaps, be allowed to say that the model school at Kilkenny had been abolished, and that its site had been purchased by Cardinal Moran, who had founded there an industrial school.

Colonel COLTHURST said, there was no doubt that the model schools were almost universally condemned in Ireland, except in one or two places in the North, where the majority of the population, or at least a very large proportion of the population, were Protestant, and made use of the model schools. But the case was quite different in the South of Ireland. Take the City of Cork, for instance; the model school there was used by the class which the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Dawson) had described—that was to say, by people who were not really entitled to have free education for their children. At another place in the county of Cork the model school was attended by a good many of the Catholic population for the reason that they could not help it, its appliances being superior to those of the parish school, with which, in consequence, it entered into unfair rivalry. In most particulars the description given by his hon. Friend the Member for Carlow (Mr. Dawson) was absolutely correct. He (Colonel Colthurst) hoped the Government would give effect to the recommendation of the Committee, and he joined his hon. Friend in asking that the schools should be made centres of technical instruction for teachers. He would like to say a few words as to the position of the Irish National teachers. He believed that they were entitled to, that they required, and that they should obtain what the present Chancellor of the Exchequer wished to give them by the Act of 1875—that was to say, that the remuneration fairly earned should not be taken away from them by extraneous causes. This was a matter in which he had always taken a good deal of interest, and he foresaw clearly when the right hon. Baronet introduced that scheme what was likely to happen. He knew that the Boards of Guardians, although they might take up the scheme, would afterwards get tired of it, and that the teachers would be left in the lurch. But even if the Boards of Guardians had taken up the scheme fairly, it would not have met the case, because there was the greatest possible difference between one Union and another, and the Union rate would have been most heavy on those Unions which were least able to afford it. Therefore, speaking for himself, he fully approved of the plan suggested in the Bill for a general compulsory rate. He did not believe that the people of Ireland, if the matter were properly put before them, would object in the least. It would mean a rate of 1*d.* in the pound. It was necessary to take into consideration the condition of society in the two countries. In England, large contributions were received from the people on account of education, not only from the rich with regard to the Government schools, but the poor had also to contribute largely to their maintenance, and, he imagined, to the maintenance of the voluntary schools also. But in Ireland, for 50 years, the State had provided education, and the people had not been called upon to contribute; and, therefore, there seemed to be no alternative, if it was desired to better their condition, but to have a general rate. He believed, also, that compulsory education, properly applied, met with the approval of the great majority of the managers of schools in Ireland, and he believed also that it would meet with the approval of the public. In England there was a provision enabling Boards of Guardians to pay the school fees in the case of voluntary schools for those scholars who they thought were not able to pay for themselves; and, of course, in respect of board schools, which he believed they would never have in Ireland, the School Board paid. He was, of course, speaking of voluntary schools when he said he did not think there would be any difficulty in applying this principle, because the people who could not pay were ratepayers, and were divided by a slender line from those who would be asked to pay for them. He did not see how the education of the country could be carried on without some provision of the kind. He regretted that Her Majesty's Government did not see their way to giving a temporary grant this year without prejudice to the question of the National teachers; but he respectfully protested against a permanent increase in the shape of class salaries. No doubt, some managers of schools were opposed to the payment of teachers by results; but it was known that three-fourths of the managers of schools looked upon payment by results as the only way of protecting the interest of the children. Hon. Members had not to look in this matter to the interest of the teachers; they must look to the interest of those they taught, and, at the same time, they must have regard to the feelings, prejudices, and opinions of the managers of schools. He did not wish to detain the Committee; but, before he sat down, he should like to call the attention of his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Tresury to one point. He asked the hon. Baronet to consider the possibility of modifying the Rules with respect to pensions and allowances to the widows of deceased National teachers in Ireland. He had the particulars of a case just submitted to him; but he would not trouble the Committee with them at that moment. No blame attached in this case to the teacher or to the Treasury; but he hoped to be allowed to submit that the Rules in respect of pensions and allowances ought to be somewhat modified.

MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY said, he could not agree with the hon. and gallant Member for Cork County (Colonel Colthurst) that a measure for compulsory payment would be accepted in Ireland. He failed to see how it could be accepted. Let it be remembered that there would be no control whatever over the way the money would be disposed of. Why, then, should the Unions be compelled to give away the money of the ratepayers? At the same time, something should be done for the teachers. He did not remember any case in which a serious attempt had been made to remedy their grievance. There was absolutely no difference of opinion as to the grievance which existed, and yet they went on year after year admitting the grievance without making any attempt to remove it. He had more hope in the present Government than he had in the late Government, and he trusted they would be able to apply a remedy; and he did not see why, even in this Session, they might not by the introduction of a Supplementary Estimate endeavour to do something in that direction. Another point to which he wished to refer was the want of technical training in Ireland. They had had an important Committee sitting to consider the condition of Irish industries, and one of the most eminent men who came before that Committee assigned three capital reasons for the depression of Irish industries. One of them was historical, another legislative, but the third was the total absence of proper technical education in Ireland. He said that the people were not taught to use their fingers and hands, and that there was an abundance of manufacturing resources all around them if their fingers, hands, and minds were able to make use of them. A number of imperfections had been revealed in this National system of education, which he hoped the Government would not allow to pass without an attempt being made to remove them.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE) said, he wanted the support of hon. Members in saying, with regard to the vast number of subjects to which attention had been called during this discussion, which had lasted for three hours, that they were subjects with which he could not adequately deal. He might also remark that, during the last three weeks, he had to go through all the Estimates connected with Ireland, and with regard to them he had received no assistance whatever from those who prepared them. Further, he would say that if all the time he mentioned had been devoted to the matters brought forward in Committee that afternoon, he should not have been able to deal with them in the way he would desire to deal with them. It was perfectly obvious to any man attempting in that House to deal with those subjects, and having an interest in Ireland, and in the future of that country, that the chief point was not only the adequate and proper education of its population, but also that the huge Department which supervised that education should be properly and efficiently conducted. He would endeavour to answer the various points which had been raised in the course of the discussion on this Vote. The hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), in the speech which he delivered at the commencement of the discussion, had brought forward some complaints with reference to the attitude of the Government towards the position of the Irish National teachers, inasmuch as they had not proposed to make now an amendment in that regard. Well, he would say that he was not there to contend that the teachers were overpaid. Although the hon. Member had taken a few of the statistics put forward by the Board of Education, yet he (the Chief Secretary) thought it due to that Department to read the Table which he had before him showing the present scale of payment to teachers as compared with the scale in 1854. As regarded the male teachers, the highest average payment from the Parliamentary grant to teachers of the highest and lowest class respectively, was in 1854—highest, £36; lowest, £15; while in 1883 it was—highest, £99; lowest, £48. As regarded female teachers, in 1854 the highest average payment from the Parliamentary grant was, in the highest class, £25, and in the lowest, £13; whereas in 1883 the highest was £85 7*s.* 10*d.*, and the lowest, £40 10*s.*

MR. SEXTON: What do those figures mean? Do they mean the highest and lowest sums allocated by Parliament for any individual teacher by way of salary or results fees?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): These figures are quoted to show that Parliament has from time to time made great improvement in the position of teachers. With regard to the Education Board, he understood that it contained many eminent men; and what they had to consider was the efficiency of the Board. The hon. Member for Sligo had brought forward a number of matters with regard to which he (the Chief Secretary) did not think that he had any special explanation to give; he did not think that the hon. Member, considering that the matters he had brought forward were of great importance, could expect him at that moment to go into them. The hon. Member had brought forward some complaints as to teachers being restricted with regard to their future in life, with regard to which he would say, without knowing anything personally of the individual cases of the teachers, that it certainly seemed to him hard that because a man was a teacher his future success and eminence in life should be barred by the fact that he had been a teacher. There were one or two other cases alluded to by the hon. Member for Sligo of hardship in respect of certain teachers, with regard to which all he could say was that they must have regard to the special circumstances which surrounded each case; and as he did not know what those circumstances were, he did not think he could proceed any further on that subject. The hon. Member had referred to the teaching of the Irish language and the supply of books. His own opinion was that the matter of the supply of books should be dealt with in a spirit of strict impartiality, and he believed that the hon. Member had every right to make that demand. With regard more particularly to the cultivation of the Irish language, to which the hon. Member had alluded, it was undoubtedly the fact that up to 1878 the language was not recognized at all in the programme of the Irish Education Board, except with reference to certain instructions to teachers. But at that time, on a representation of the Society for the Preservation of the Irish Language, the Commissioners put the teaching of that language on the same footing as Greek and other languages. Later on, with the view of encouraging the study of the language, the Commissioners made a rule that no extra fee should be paid for learning the language. The hon. Member might think that that was not a very gigantic stride; but he believed he would admit that it was a step in the direction he desired. The hon. and learned Member for Kildare (Mr. Meldon) had made a proposal with regard to teachers, and their general position as to pay and pensions. Of course, he was aware that the hon. and learned Member had for many years brought forward Motions on this subject. The hon. and learned Member had referred to the pledges made by the present Chancellor of the Exchequer in 1875 with regard to this matter. He could not, of course, in the absence of his right hon. Friend, enter fully into that question. It was impossible for him to deal specifically with the matter; but he thought that, in justice to his right hon. Friend, he ought to say that although pledges might have been given, yet he believed that the scale he had quoted with reference to the position of the teachers showed that up to 1883 a material improvement had taken place in respect of the amounts paid to them. But there was one point, with reference to the Bill of the present year introduced by the late Government, to which the hon. and learned Member had particularly referred. It would be impossible to deal with that Bill, because there were points in it relating to compulsory education and other matters which would give rise to contention—at least, so he was informed. Of course, it was not to be expected that, at the end of July, Her Majesty's Government could take up a scheme of this kind. In the first statement which the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) made in the House with reference to Public Business, he stated he did not propose to take any contentious Business. Now, the proposal of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Kildare had been met by something very like the unanimous disapprobation of hon. Members sitting below the Gangway opposite. With his limited information, he did not say whether the scheme was a right one or not; but he was bound to take the fact as he found it. He certainly did not think he would be justified in attempting to deal with the scheme in the last days of July. Now, with reference to the question of the Irish school teachers, and all the other subjects which had been mentioned, he admitted frankly that he was standing there that day rather as a learner than as a teacher. Of course, it was utterly impossible, with the information he had at hand, to give pledges with regard to what should in future be done concerning the teachers; but he did acknowledge the claim the teachers had with respect to pensions. The subject had been alluded to, and he thought very properly, in the course of the discussion. In a certain sense there was a substantial grievance existing which ought, if possible, to be remedied, particularly as he believed a considerable grant had ceased to be made in respect to the question. He acknowledged, too, that the fund which it was now proposed to make use of was essentially of an Irish character, and did not come under any English Exchequer. He had been in communication with his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) upon this question, and the hon. Gentleman, and those with whom he was in concert at the Treasury, had examined the circumstances of the fund very carefully in the endeavour to see how far they could meet the claims of the Irish teachers in reference to pensions. It had been calculated that the surplus of the Pension Fund now available for this purpose was £200,000, and it was proposed to dispose of that sum as follows:—At present, when a teacher was dismissed, it was usual that he should be repaid the yearly premium he had paid to come under the scheme. It was proposed to extend that principle, and that in a case where a teacher died there should be a repayment to his representatives. It was calculated that that would dispose of the sum of £34,700. Then it was proposed that for pension purposes certain former divisions in the senior classes of teachers should be recognized, and that would take up £3,518. The cost of the two arrangements would be £38,218, so that there would still be £158,369 to dispose of. The other chief change was with reference to the actual pensions themselves. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Kildare had urged that the age at which retirement was granted should be reduced from 65 to 58. The Treasury found it was utterly impossible with the fund at their command to sanction such a scheme. It was proposed to deal with the matter in another way, but still in a way which it was considered would afford some relief. It was proposed to keep the age of compulsory retirement as at present, but to provide that a man or woman should be allowed to retire on a full pension after completing 40 years' service from the ages of 21 and 18 respectively. Assuming, as the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Meldon) had stated, that most of the teachers commenced their duties at an early age, it was obvious that if, after 40 years' service, they could retire on full pension, it would be a certain relief to them. The question of teachers' residences had also been raised by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Kildare. It was proposed, by the Bill of the late Government, to which he had already alluded, to deal with that question. It was a very important question, and one on which he did not think he ought to be pressed at that moment. He promised hon. Gentlemen that the matter should receive his consideration. Then, again, something had been said with regard to the model schools. Broadly speaking, it was proposed that the model schools should be abolished, and that the fund which sustained them should be handed over for the benefit of technical education. That was a new proposal to him, and one which he was sure was not to be hastily accepted. The condition of the four Dublin schools had been referred to, and reasons had been given why the model schools were not attended by any considerable number of Roman Catholics. He found, however, that in the four Dublin schools, there were 1,810 Roman Catholics and 947 Protestants. In a model school in County Cork there were 332 Roman Catholics and 32 Protestants. Of course, he was perfectly aware that in the case of model schools in the North of Ireland the same results would not be found. He was bound to say that, with the knowledge he at present possessed, he could not assent to the suggestion to abolish those schools. He now desired to make a few remarks of a general nature. No one knew better than he did, even with his limited acquaintance of the country, that there were vast difficulties to contend with in regard to education in Ireland as compared with the difficulties attending education in this country. He assured hon. Members that, whether he remained in Office months or years, he should not shirk the difficulties. He was already aware of their existence, and therefore he ought not to approach Irish educational subjects in a light-hearted spirit. There was one fact to which he desired to call the attention of the Committee, and it was that although there were great difficulties to contend with in reference to all educational questions in Ireland, the Exchequer had not been stationary in the matter of educational grants. He found that, according to the Appropriation Account for the year 1880, the amount granted for educational purposes in Ireland was £631,520. He was reminded by his hon. Friend (Sir Henry Holland) that that was not the expenditure of that year, but the average yearly expenditure for five years. The amount now granted annually was £786,300. He merely mentioned that to show that the English Exchequer had not been altogether indifferent to the claims of Irish education. He thanked the Committee for the patience with which they had received his remarks. If his observations had indicated any ignorance of the question with which he had had to deal, he could not complain if he was reminded of it at once. He assured hon. Members from Ireland that he had thrown himself heart and soul not only into the question of Irish education, but into all the entangled and difficult matters with which in the last few weeks he had had to deal. Of course, if he had failed to indicate anything like a policy, or to indicate anything like firmness in dealing with those vast problems, he assured hon. Members that it was not because he had any indisposition to grapple with those difficult questions. If, in future, he was called upon to deal with Irish educational and other matters in a practical way, and to supervise the different Departments which came within the cognizance of the Chief Secretary, he hoped that he would not be found wanting.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary might rest assured that in this matter he would receive from the Irish Members nothing but kindly and proper treatment. They were quite prepared to give kindness for kindness, as he thought they had proved they were ready to give blow for blow. They appreciated fully the spirit in which the right hon. Gentleman had spoken; and even if he had spoken in a different spirit, they would not come whining to the House, as the noble Marquess the Leader of the Opposition (the Marquess of Hartington) had insinuated they were apt to do. Now, he was glad to observe that on the question of Irish education an enormous advance had been made in the public opinion of this country. They had had various schemes of local self-government offered by different Gentlemen representing different Parties; but on one point of local government the authors of those schemes seemed to agree, and that was that the education of Ireland should be removed from the control of a central, irresponsible, and Governmentally-appointed Board to that of a Board elected by the people and responsible to the people. Now, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary had just said that, considering his short official experience, he could not be expected to deal exhaustively with this question. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) was convinced the Irish Members would much prefer that the settlement of this question should be postponed than that it should be taken up in a tinkering manner. The settlement of the question of elementary education in Ireland must be a settlement of a broad and, as far as possible, of a final character. Now, with regard to the question of the treatment of the National teachers. He entirely agreed with the survey of that part of the question presented so ably by his hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton). His hon. Friend was more acquainted with the working of the system than any other Member of the House; but he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) had received letters from National School teachers—whose names for obvious reasons he could not give—in which they entirely corroborated the picture of their condition and of their grievances which was drawn by the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sexton). He had a letter from a teacher who had been 35 years in the service of the Board. That teacher had never once received the slightest rebuke for neglect or misconduct, and yet for eight years he had been trying, without success, to get permission to go from the second division of the first class to the first division. It was monstrous that a teacher who imagined himself competent to be appointed to the first division of the first class should not have immediate opportunity of obtaining the promotion. His hon. Friend (Mr. Sexton) told him that out of the whole body of 11,000 teachers in Ireland only 200 had been allowed to go in for this examination. That was altogether contrary to the principle on which teachers were treated in any other country in the world. There were several other grievances of the National teachers into which he might go; but he would abstain from doing so, because the ground had been so well covered by his hon. Friend (Mr. Sexton). There was a question to which he had called attention on more than one occasion, and to which he would call attention again, and that was the character of the books which were supplied to the school children in Ireland. By taking up that question, he had exposed himself to a certain amount of not very friendly criticism. When he first raised the question a gentleman wrote to the London *Times* to say that he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) did not know what he was talking about. Of course, he accepted very gratefully such a rebuke from an enlightened Englishman. He believed the essence of the charge against him was that the quotations he had made were from editions that had ceased to be used in the National schools of Ireland. If he did make that mistake on a former occasion he was fortunately in a position not to repeat it, for he had in his hand the most recent editions, sent to him by a gentleman connected with the Education Department in Dublin—a social friend of his own for whom he had the greatest respect. That gentleman was under the impression that he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) had been rather hard on the literature of the Department, and in order that he might enlighten his (Mr. T. P. O'Connor's) darkness and soften his animosity to the institution, he sent to him the series of books used in the schools. Accordingly, he came armed out of the official armoury on this question. What his friend wanted to impress on his mind was that the school books had been greatly improved, especially in the direction in which he had said improvement was wanted. Now, his first charge against the books was that as literature they were contemptible. He was sure that any Member of the Committee, whether he agreed with his (Mr. T. P. O'Connor's) political principles or not, would agree with him in this—that good literature ought to be given in the school books which children had to read. His complaint of the inferiority of the literature was applied to the original writings—they were very original indeed—which appeared in the books. The second charge he made was with regard to the extracts. Now, the extracts were taken from the works of some of the most eminent poetical and prose writers of the century, and were models of good style; but though they appeared in books under a system of education called National, they were entirely anti-National in their character. He put it to any candid man in the Committee, or outside of the Committee, whether anything could be imagined more preposterous than that the whole childhood of a nation should be brought up without an opportunity of learning even the elements of the history of the nation to which they belonged. That, however, was the tendency of the books supplied to the National schools of Ireland. So far as the books were calculated to give an idea of the early history of the country to which the reader belonged, they might as well be given to the children of France, or Germany, or Timbuctoo. His friend who sent him the books said that the charge was not correct; that though the previous editions might have been wanting in the direction pointed out, the new editions contained a large number of quotations from the works of Irish National writers. He found his friend was perfectly right in one sense; a large number of quotations from the writings of Irish National poets had been inserted, but the quotations were not of a distinctively National character. An answer to his charge would be to put in the books some of the National poems of Thomas Moore. Several quotations from the works of National poets had been given. For instance, he found several quotations from *Deirdrè*, written by R. D. Joyce. *Deirdrè* was a poem which might take its place amongst the prominent poetical literature of Ireland; but to what period of Irish history did it allude to? The poem, which was given on page 24 of the Fifth Reading Book, was entitled, *The Flight of the Sons of Usna from Ulster to Scotland*, and there was a note to the effect—

> "The sons of Usna, three young heroes, renowned in Gaelic traditional story, who were unjustly put to death by Conor Mac Nessa, King of Ulster, about the beginning of the Christian era."

And all the history of Ireland which was to be found in those books, whether in the shape of poetry or prose, ended with the beginning of the Christian era, and before any era which was not altogether Christian. He found also that there was a quotation from Moore—*Silent, oh Moyle*, it was called, being a story of a swan which wandered over the lakes and rivers of Ireland before the coming of Christianity. Well, he maintained that his charge was rather proved than disproved by the poems of a so-called National character which had been put in the books. They wanted the children of Ireland to know something about the history of their country after the beginning as well as before the Christian era. There was a little about the scenery of Ireland—very badly done. There was a good deal of the biography of Edmund Burke. Of course, the name of Edmund Burke was dear to every Irishman; but, curiously enough, in the biography of Burke there was not a syllable about the splendid and noble part he took in regard to the wrongs of his own people, though there was some reference to the part he took respecting the War of Independence. There was nothing about Irish battles subsequent to the beginning of the Christian era, but there was a good deal about English battles. He did not care much about the battle pieces of any country; but if there were to be accounts of battles in books used in the Irish National schools surely the accounts ought to be of Irish battles where Irish valour was displayed to advantage. He found nothing whatever about the Battle of Clontarf, but there was given Campbell's well-known poem about the Battle of the Baltic. In the preface to the poem it was said—

> "By hugging the Swedish shore *our ships* passed the Sound out of range of the Danish forts."

But the ships were not Irish ships, they were English ships. Now, with regard to Kings. He had told the Committee that in these school books there was something about English battles, but nothing about Irish battles; and, in the same way, there was something about English Kings, but nothing whatever about Irish Kings. He did not think there was an Irishman who was not familiar with the name and exploits of Brian Boroihue. There was no mention, however, of that Irish King in these school books; but there was an article upon Alfred the Great. Here was the beginning of it—

> "*Our own* Alfred sheds a much brighter glory over the ninth century than Charlemagne and the Caliph Haroun do over the eighth."

"*Our own* Alfred!" That might be said to belong to what was called the "too-too" literature. However, they had a little modern history; he was wrong in saying there was no modern history. Strange to say, that in an Irish school book, there was an essay on "Liberty," and the author of it was Earl Russell. The author naturally spoke on behalf of his cause; but he had to remember Earl Russell, the statesman, and to remember also that he himself had suspended the Habeas Corpus Act. Accordingly, they had the Habeas Corpus thus described—

> "Since the Revolution, however, the Act of Habeas Corpus, when in operation, has always been found of power to protect the subject. The very suspensions of this Act prove its practical efficacy when in force, as much as the renewals of Magna Charta prove the practical inefficacy of that great compact."

Therefore, the oftener a man was put

in prison, under the suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, the more the practical efficacy of the measure was proved. They were also favoured in those books with some quotations from Archbishop Whately's writings on political economy. He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) remembered that some years ago an agitation was raised in this country—he thought by the hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Broadhurst)—with regard to some quotations which appeared in some of the English school books on the work or action of Trades' Unions. Archbishop Whately was an economist of the old school; he was bitterly opposed to Trades' Unions, and he made some very strong remarks with regard to the action of those bodies. Some of his writings found their way into English school books, and the hon. Member for Stoke called the attention of the House to the matter. The result was that the condemnatory remarks were removed from the books, on the ground that the children of Trades' Unionists ought not to be prejudiced against the institutions to which their parents belonged. Now, in the Irish school books there was a specimen of the political economy of Archbishop Whately; it dealt with letting and hiring, and the question of rent—a question of some delicacy in Ireland. This was what Archbishop Whately said—

> "Suppose all landlords were to agree to lower their rents one-half, the number of acres of land and the quantity of corn raised would remain the same, and so would the number of mouths that want corn. The farmer, therefore, would get the same price for his corn as he does now; the only difference would be that he would be so much the richer, and the landlord so much the poorer; the labourers and the rest of the people would be no better off than before."

Again—

> "If you were to make a law for lowering rents, so that the land should still remain the property of those to whom it now belongs, but that they should not be allowed to receive more than so much an acre for it; the only effect of this would be, that the landlord would no longer let his land to a farmer, but would take it into his own hands and employ a bailiff to look after it for him."

So, in order that the political economy of Archbishop Whately should be proved to be correct, every farm on which a judicial rent had been fixed by the Land Act of 1881 should at present be unoccupied by the landlord, and untilled by the tenant, and a bailiff put in to take care of it—a thing which had not taken place, and which he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) ventured to prophecy would not take place. There were other quotations in those books. He supposed it was regarded as a concession to Ireland that there should be quotations from the writings of Cardinal Newman. He should be glad to see more quotations from Cardinal Newman's works, because Cardinal Newman was one of the greatest masters of writing that any country or any century had produced. There was no doubt that as regarded style of writing the quotation given was one of the best examples which could be given—namely, his marvellous description of locusts. But why did not the compilers of the book quote Cardinal Newman's beautiful and eloquent testimony with regard to Irish character, and the past and future of the Irish people? There was a quotation from the writings of Cardinal Wiseman; but it was a quotation with regard to nothing Irish, but had reference to the catacombs of Rome. There was a quotation from Aubrey De Vere, but not a word from his noble poem of *Innisfail;* there were certain quotations from Moore, but they were of an entirely non-national character; there was a quotation from James Clarence Mangan, but there were no quotations from his splendid poems on Irish character and history—the quotation had reference to his poem, *Charlemagne and the Bridge of Moonbeams.* There were several long quotations from the books of Sir Walter Scott; there was one which covered three pages on the sports in the Highlands of Scotland. There was nothing with regard to the sports of Irishmen. There was one quotation with respect to Irish patriots, but the last Irish patriot mentioned in the National school books was Grattan—O'Connell and the other patriots of more modern days were unnoticed. There was a quotation with regard to the industrial resources of Ireland; but care was taken to omit the expression of opinion in the very book—*The Industries of Ireland*—from which the quotation was made, that Ireland was capable of nourishing a population of 16,000,000. There was a quotation from Denis Florence M'Carthy, but it was not a quotation from his National poems. In fact, these school books, instead of doing everything to encourage, did everything to discourage, National literature. Just one word more. It was well great stress should be laid upon the necessity of Irish history being taught in Irish schools. He knew a great many educated Irishmen—he did not know whether he could venture to put himself in that category — who knew less of the history of Ireland than of any other country. If a publisher were to come to any Irishman on these Benches—save perhaps to the hon. Member for Westmeath (Mr. Sullivan) and the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), who had devoted a great portion of their time to the study of Irish history—and asked him to write a history of Ireland, it was doubtful whether he would undertake the task, no matter what amount of money was offered as an inducement, because he would, first of all, have to spend 10 years in learning the elements of Irish history which he ought to have learnt in his youth. That was a perfectly intolerable and shameful state of things. It was all nonsense to say they could not get an impartial history of Ireland. To a man who was well acquainted with the history of Ireland, it was the easiest thing in the world to write an impartial history of that country. It would not, however, be an impartial history of Ireland, if it was said that penal laws meant toleration laws, or that the massacre of Drogheda was a proper act of warfare. Were the English afraid of having Irish history written in Ireland? Did they think their rule in Ireland would shake under a knowledge of their past misdeeds?

Colonel NOLAN said, he thought the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary made rather too many apologies for his want of knowledge on Irish affairs. The Irish Members were quite aware that the right hon. Gentleman had not only had the Educational Estimates to deal with, but the whole of the Irish Estimates, and they were ready to grant that in some matters he had shown considerable knowledge of detail. Still, on every point, he had not been able to make up his mind; indeed, he (Colonel Nolan) thought the right hon. Gentleman had pledged himself rather too far in regard to pensions and to model schools, and that on reconsideration he would be inclined to modify the pledges he had given. Unfortunately, the want of information on the part of the right hon. Gentleman was a very serious matter, because, in consequence, the case of the National teachers in Ireland was left in precisely the same state it was found at the commencement of the debate. He (Colonel Nolan) quite admitted that this was not a subject which was purely within the Chief Secretary's exclusive purview. It was a question which the Cabinet and the Chancellor of the Exchequer must, to a considerable extent, consider, because it might possibly involve legislation and the expenditure of a large sum of money. He hoped that before the debate closed they would receive from the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), who was one of the best-informed men in the House on the question of Irish education, some intimation with regard to the grievances of the National teachers. The right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary read some extracts with the object of showing that the National teachers of Ireland received more money now than they did in 1854. Certainly, 1854 was a long time ago, and a time when education was not regarded as a matter which should be highly paid for. In 1854 the Educational Estimates for England and Wales were very small—he believed they did not amount to more than £500,000 sterling. Since then, however, they had gradually increased until now, when they were over £3,000,000. The rate of advance in the Educational Estimates for England and Wales was very remarkable, having been something like £300,000 a-year for the last 10 or 12 years. But there had not been a corresponding increase in the Irish Estimates for education; there was a rise this year, but there had not been one every year. The extraordinary increase of late years in the English Estimates had completely changed the aspects of the educational question. It was said that, in proportion, as large a grant was made to Ireland as to England. He believed the sum granted per head of the population was this year, for the first time, very much the same in the two countries. It would be found, however, that the administration in Ireland was much worse than that in England. What was desired in Ireland was that the teachers should be well paid. Of course, Ireland received a grant for the model schools; but that ought not to be credited against them. The Irish people did not want the model-school system; they would rather not have it. Well, as he had already said, the English and Irish population received almost exactly the same amount per head. If, however, the question of education was to be taken in its broader aspects, and Science and Art were to be included, more money was given per head of the population to England than to Ireland. The amount of population was not the only point to be taken into consideration. He found that the Government was always very ready to ignore the fact that in Ireland the population was distributed much more thinly than in England, and that the consequence was that the schools were much more thinly scattered over the country than in England. In England the population congregated in large towns, and was handled much more economically than in Ireland. It was quite clear, judging from the debates on English education, that in the public schools of England something more than an elementary education was given—a really good education was given. So his case was this—that the Government gave the same amount per head of the population, but they did not take into consideration the fact that the Irish schools were so much more thinly scattered, and that the Irish schoolmasters only received about half the salaries English schoolmasters were paid. It would be found, on inquiry, that instead of there being five times as many schoolmasters in England as in Ireland—as there should be, according to the population—there were only 11,437, as against 4,488 in Ireland. Although Ireland received the same amount per head, the money had to be spread over a larger area. The schoolmasters of Ireland got very little money indeed in comparison with their English *confrères.* A good many figures had been put before the Committee; but no one had referred to the Return presented last March. That Return showed that only 10 per cent of the schoolmasters in Ireland got over £100 a-year, and that the bulk of them were paid from £62 to £80 a-year. Now, 70 per cent of the schoolmasters in England got over £100 a-year. The discrepancy in this matter between England and Ireland was, therefore, enormous. A schoolmaster in Ireland must be remarkably clever to be included in the 10 per cent; 135 Irish schoolmasters got over £100 a-year, while in England there were 1,700 who received from £150 to £200 a-year; 700 who received from £200 to £250; 290 who received from £250 to £300; and a certain number got over £300. This under-payment produced most grave discontent amongst the National School teachers in Ireland. The grievance was one which the Government ought to remedy without a day's delay. If he were asked how it should be remedied, he should say that, in addition to the provision for pensions, the salaries should be increased out of the National Exchequer, and free sites for the schools obtained. If sites were obtained, he did not anticipate much difficulty in building schools. He did not want the Government to find sites, but to find legislation by which cheap and easy means of finding sites would be provided. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Border Burghs (Mr. Trevelyan) admitted that, in regard to the question of school sites, there was an undoubted grievance; and he (Colonel Nolan) thought the present Government might fairly give an assurance that they would remedy the grievance. He acknowledged that one of the evils in Ireland at the present moment was that there were too many competing schools. The consequence was that the schools were badly attended, and that the salaries of the teachers were unduly lowered. What was the reason of the existence of so many schools? It was that the Government would never map out the country and say—"There must be a school here, and another here." The sites were taken which could be got, no regard being had to their advantages. There were too many schoolmasters, and they were badly paid. Nothing would make the Irish schoolmasters satisfied, nothing would make them think they were not suffering great injustice, while they only got half the pay of men in a similar position in England.

THE CHAIRMAN (Sir ARTHUR OTWAY): The hon. and gallant Gentleman has, within the last quarter of an hour, very often repeated the same arguments with regard to the payment of Irish schoolmasters. I must point out that, though it might not be out of Order if every point and branch of an

Estimate were discussed in the manner in which the hon. and gallant Gentleman is discussing this subject, it would be perfectly impossible to get through the Business of Supply in a much longer Session than one of six months.

Colonel NOLAN apologized if he had repeated himself. He was so impressed with the necessity of remedying the grievance which existed in regard to the inequality between the schoolmasters in the two countries that he wished to do everything to attract the attention of the Government to the subject. Up to the present scarcely a word had proceeded from the Treasury Bench as to the increase of the schoolmasters' salaries. It had been pointed out that there was an extravagant discrepancy between the salaries of the two classes. Well, he wished to discuss some of the remedies which had been suggested in the course of this debate. There was one which had been proposed by two or three hon. Gentlemen. Now, he had a great respect for all except that one—namely, that of the hon. and gallant Member for Cork County (Colonel Colthurst), and it seemed to him that the hon. and gallant Member would like to put as much as possible on the rates. The hon. and gallant Gentleman's remedy was to put the schoolmaster's salary upon the rates; and that seemed to him (Colonel Nolan) a very bad remedy. In the first place, the poor rates were altogether too heavy at the present moment in Ireland; and, in the next place, a school rate was not the kind of rate which should be imposed upon the people in this matter, because they excluded from the Poor Law Unions in Ireland the very class of people who ought to manage the schools—namely, the clergy. Hon. Members were perfectly well aware that clergymen were excluded from the Boards of Guardians in Ireland. If there was any Board of any kind instituted for the management of those schools, he should like to say, in passing, that he would wish to see ladies appointed upon it, as was the case in England. Ladies, he believed, were ineligible in Ireland; at any rate, they did not sit on the Boards; and, to his mind, it would be very judicious indeed to hand over the management of the Poor Law Unions to a body which would not exclude the two useful classes to which he had referred—namely, the clergy and ladies—two classes which ought to be closely connected with the management of schools.

Colonel COLTHURST: What I said was, that I wanted the schools to be managed exactly as they are now, but upon contributions from the whole of Ireland.

Colonel NOLAN said, that a proposition that those schools should be handed over to other Boards in Ireland, and to the Poor Law Unions to a certain extent, had come from the Benches upon which he himself was sitting in the course of the debate. He did not himself object very much to the system of National schools. He believed it to be a good one, and one which suited the country. Unless they had an Irish Parliament, which could frame Rules upon those questions, and which would be subject only to the veto of the Crown, he did not think they would be likely to have any change, owing to the division of Parties in this country. He did not think they could catch the High Church in England, or please the Low Church. He did not think that any set of Rules that they could form would be likely to be better than those in force. The National system, when first introduced, was a bad one, and was used, to a certain extent, for the purposes of proselytizing; but now that it had been 20 or 30 years at work, as it did not interfere with the consciences of the children, he was inclined to think, from his knowledge of it in the West of Ireland, that it was a good one. Their real difficulty was a financial one, including the matter of the low payment of the school teachers. That was the question which, at the present moment, most immediately pressed upon them. Though he did not see the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer in the House, nor any other Member of the Cabinet who formerly interested himself in the question of Irish education, he sincerely hoped that before the debate closed some Member of the Government would hold out some hope to the National School teachers in regard to an increase of pay, for up to the present moment there had been nothing said in the debate which would at all lead them to suppose that the Government had seriously determined how they could get rid of this grievance. He was entirely in favour of free education—that was to say, the whole cost of elementary education coming out of the National Exchequer. So long as it was elementary, the State and the nation should pay the whole sum, because it was to the interests of the country that every child should have a moderate amount of education. He held it to be absolutely dangerous to leave the children of poor people without education; and if they gave it to the children of the poor, he did not see how in equity they could refuse it to the children of the rich, seeing that it was the rich people who had to pay the taxes. If, however, they had schools which taught more than elementary education, it was quite proper and right that the districts should bear their own rate; but he thought it ought to be the duty of the Government to see that all children received an elementary education, and in order to secure that they ought to see that the teachers were properly paid. His contention was that, at the present moment, the teachers were not properly paid—in fact, that they were wretchedly paid—and that it was the duty of the Government to do something to improve their position. He thought they might start with the proposition that National School teachers should be paid properly, that the Chief Secretary should adopt that proposition, and have the remedy left to himself and his Colleagues. He (Colonel Nolan) merely pointed out, as a suggestion, that the necessary amount of money should come out of the National Exchequer. It was only fair that the matter should be taken in hand. It would be grossly unfair to say that those teachers should remain in their present condition of wretchedness while the Government was making up its mind as to what course should be taken. The Chief Secretary had not a seat in the Cabinet; but he (Colonel Nolan) thought that in this matter some other Member of the Government who was in the Cabinet was bound to come forward and give them his views as to the money part of the question.

MR. MOLLOY said, he wished to point out to the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary that in dealing with the amounts paid to the teachers in Ireland he had stated that they ranged from £48 to £99.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): No, no.

MR. MOLLOY said, that was so; and if the right hon. Gentleman would look into the matter he would find that that was correct. The right hon. Gentleman had read the figures from a paper which had been supplied to him from the Education Department in Ireland—they were read in opposition to some figures stated from those Benches. It was stated that payments ranged from a minimum of £48 to a maximum of £99. He was speaking of the school teachers, and he was quite certain of the figures, because he had taken them down at the time they were read. Well, those figures were not by any means correct. If they added £99 and £48 together, that would make £147 or £150, which would produce an average of £75 per head per teacher in Ireland. Now, the actual facts were that a teacher in that country got nothing like that sum. At the outside, he did not get more than £61 or £62 a-year.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): I find the hon. Member is correct. £99 is the highest, and £48 is the lowest.

MR. MOLLOY said, that that would give an average of £75; but those figures, he could assure the right hon. Gentleman, were entirely incorrect. He had no doubt they were made up by adding together the salaries of the teachers and a number of items which should not be added together. As a matter of fact, as he had stated, the average amount received by the teachers in Ireland was only £61 or £62. What he would ask the right hon. Gentleman on this point was whether he would lay on the Table a statement as to how those figures were made up? Because, of course, it was all very well for him to give the figures handed to him on the one side, and for hon. Members to deny them on the other; but what they wanted to get at was the actual amount paid. Would the right hon. Gentleman consent to lay on the Table the figures that made up the items he had given as the amounts paid to the teachers? The matter was one of considerable importance, and one upon which he was sure they all desired to be accurate. Another point was the teaching of the Irish language in National schools. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that the Irish language was taught at the present time in Irish National schools, and that encouragement was given in that branch of study; and he (the Chief Secretary) had gone on to state that Irish was placed in the some list as Latin and Greek. Well, he (Mr. Molloy) did not think that among the peasant population in Ireland or any other country to place a language on the same list as Latin and Greek was calculated to give them a fair opportuity of studying it. This matter was one of the highest importance in some of the Irish-speaking parts of Ireland. In many places the people spoke only the Irish language. He would, therefore, press upon the right hon. Gentleman the desirability of putting Irish on a lower level, and of removing it from the level of the extras to which he had alluded. Now, with regard to these model schools in Ireland. While the right hon. Gentleman had been speaking with reference to them he (Mr. Molloy) had made a calculation. He had come to the conclusion that the right hon. Gentleman's observations were not in accord with the views of the people; and he had made a calculation as to the cost of each pupil in the schools. The right hon. Gentleman had pointed out that the Royal Commission which had reported on the efficiency of those schools had condemned them in strong terms as being inefficient, and had stated that the standard of education was far below what it ought to be. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that he did not like figures very much. Well, he would not give the right hon. Gentleman any large number of figures; but he would just mention the result of his calculation, and it was this—that the cost of each pupil in those model schools which had been condemned by the Royal Commission was £5 10*s.* per annum. Those schools had been proved to be far below the regular standard of education in the National Schools. The cost of children educated in the National Schools amounted to something under 30*s.* per head, so that, as a matter of fact, they were paying nearly three times the amount per child for education in the model schools that they were paying in the National Schools. He put that fact before the right hon. Gentleman as a further reason why he should devote his attention as soon as possible to the subject of those model schools. There was another item in the Estimates to which he wished to call attention. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilkenny (Mr. Marum) had stated that the model school at Kilkenny had been closed. He (Mr. Molloy) did not know whether that was the fact or not, or whether the Chief Secretary or the Irish Law Officers were in a position to make a statement on the point. Still, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Kilkenny, who ought to be well acquainted with the subject, had stated that the school was closed; and yet if they turned to the Estimates, they found that it was included in it, and that a very large sum of money was asked for. He would point that out to the attention of the Chief Secretary. Of course, he was well aware that it was impossible to go through all these details. The complaints the right hon. Gentleman had made were well founded. The right hon. Gentleman had pointed out that, although the Estimates were prepared by the late Government, he had received no assistance from any Member of that Government in dealing with them. The right hon. Gentleman had stated that to-day publicly—that those responsible for the Estimates had deliberately abstained from coming to the House, and from offering himself or his Colleagues any assistance in explaining the Estimates. It was especially worthy of remark that during the whole time the Estimates had been under discussion, the Front Opposition Bench, on which the Members of the late Government now sat, had been empty from the beginning even to the end. Of course, one of the reasons or explanations for that was to be found in the fact that some exceedingly awkward questions were to be asked. Those who should have faced those questions had escaped from the responsibility of the Estimates, and when all these complaints were to have been brought forward, had calmly and quietly laid the whole burden on the present Chief Secretary, in order that any odium which might attach to anything which had been done, or had been left undone, might attach to the right hon. Gentleman and his Colleagues. The escape attempted in this matter by Members of the late Administration was one of those electioneering tricks practised by Members of opposing Parties.

Mr. MELDON said, he did not wish to continue the discussion in a controversial spirit; but he rose to inquire what was proposed to be done with the Pension Fund mentioned by the Chief Secretary? He should be glad to know whether the impression on his mind was a correct idea of the condition of affairs. He took it that it was proposed to make a pension scheme by enabling teachers who had been 40 years in the service, whether male or female, to obtain the maximum amount of pension. He did not know whether he was correct in anticipating that the distinction between male and female, as it at present existed, was about to be abolished. That was the first and, he thought, the most material point. In the next place, he understood that it was proposed that in the event of a teacher being dismissed the service, that all premiums which he might have paid to the Pension Fund should be returned to him. [The CHIEF SECRETARY: They are now.] Yes, they were at the present time. He understood that a similar rule was to be applied to the representatives of teachers who might die in the service without having received any pension. In those respects the pension scheme was to be amended, and in those respects only. Then he wished for some further information as to what the fund of £196,000 was, and as to where the matter stood. A sum had been appropriated from the Church Surplus Fund to the creation of pensions, and yet it was said that that fund did not make up the pensions. On the other hand, it was said by many who had some knowledge on the subject that the amount of interest on the principal sum, and the contributions made by the teachers, was much more than was necessary to pay the pensions according to the fixed scale. He did not know that there was any other fund except this principal sum and the contributions of teachers. He should like to have some information, therefore, as to what this sum of £196,000 was. Was it a saving? Where did it come from? Was it only a surplus that it might be anticipated would be realized hereafter? Those were the points on which he thought some information ought to be given, so that hon. Members might thoroughly understand them. He would also ask that Papers should be laid on the Table of the House showing how those figures were arrived at, and what the changes were which were proposed to be made in the pension scheme. He wished to remove a misapprehension which seemed to exist in the minds of hon. Members as to his original suggestion that the Government should proceed with the Bill introduced by their Predecessors. His suggestion was that they should eliminate all matter out of the Bill save the matter of dealing with the compulsory rate and the National rate. He had stated, and he would repeat, that the National rate was proposed by him in 1875, and was now adopted for the purpose of removing a number of difficulties which a compulsory rate would bring about. If the Guardians of the Unions were to subscribe for the carrying on of education, he thought it only fair that they should make a claim to have a voice in the distribution of the money. Without hesitation he would say—whatever might be said to the contrary—that nine-tenths of the people of Ireland would refuse to enter into the difficult question of school boards.

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) said, the Report which he thought had been laid on the Table, and which would be circulated amongst hon. Members, was the Report of the quinquennial valuation of the Teachers' Pension Fund. That fund was made up of £1,300,000 and the compulsory stoppages from teachers' emoluments. He would not now go through the details of the Report; but it was calculated—the value of future premiums being considered and the gross liabilities being deducted—that there would be a surplus of £196,587. The question, then, was how to deal with that surplus. Two of the grievances that the teachers felt had been removed—or, rather, it was proposed to remove them. Premiums which had been paid by teachers, together with interest at 3 per cent, were to be returned to the representatives of teachers who had died in the service without having received pensions. There was another point of a somewhat more technical character. There were two classes of teachers upon special footing, serving in obsolete classes, and the grievance long felt by them in respect of their pensions would be removed in their favour. The other points, he thought, had been correctly stated by the hon. Member except on one matter. It was proposed to keep the age of compulsory retirement as it at present stood—namely, at 65 for men and 63 for women. Male and female teachers, however, would be allowed to retire on their maximum pensions after completing 40 years service, on full-pay from the ages of 21 and 18 respectively. He would again repeat that in considering this scheme great attention had been paid to the question of length of service; and it would be observed that service was now made an element in determining when a teacher might retire voluntarily. Thus they met, to a certain extent, the views of those who had so long urged that service, instead of age, should be made the basis of the grant of pension. He hoped this explanatien would be satisfactory.

Mr. MOLLOY: Is the model school at Kilkenny to be closed?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): It appears from the Estimate that it is not. These accounts, however, were prepared some months ago, and it is just possible that the school may have been closed after their preparation. I will obtain information on the subject.

Mr. MOLLOY: I think the school has been closed for a considerable time, and if that is the case this Estimate has no right to appear here at all.

Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN said, he had listened to the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary with very great interest; in fact, with a feeling of surprise to a certain extent. This feeling of surprise was caused by the candour and honesty with which the subject had been treated from the Front Ministerial Bench. The right hon. Gentleman had fairly said that, having been but a few months in Office, he had not been able to master the details of the question, and had not been able to struggle with the difficult and complex questions which had come before him connected with the government of Ireland. It was quite a novelty to the Irish Members to hear anything of that kind from that quarter. The usual thing, whoever occupied that position—however long or however short a time they had been connected with the administration of Irish affairs—was to profess to know all about Ireland, and to be able to correct the views and figures and statements of Irish Members on every subject connected with their country. As a rule, those right hon. and hon. Gentlemen spoke with the utmost confidence from the briefs supplied to them by the various Departments in Ireland; and when once they had delivered themselves from their places in that House, it was considered that "Sir Oracle" had spoken, and the statements of the Irish Members all round seemed to go for very little. He considered that the right hon. Gentleman had done well and befittingly on this occasion, and, he was sure, had recommended himself to the consideration and kindly feeling of the Irish Members. But he wondered whether it struck the right hon. Gentleman, or anyone else in this Committee, how odd a thing it was that on every change of Government in England officials unacquainted with these matters were thrust into the Government of Ireland, and were expected forthwith to learn their lesson, and to be able to contradict and controvert every statement made by Irishmen who had been conversant with these subjects and had had to deal with them all their lives. Did it not occur to the right hon. Gentleman and to his Government that all these complicated and difficult matters could be settled quite as well by Irishmen in Ireland as by people who were complete strangers to the business? The right hon. Gentleman had told them that there had been within a period of, he did not know how many years, but for a very long period indeed, a considerable amelioration of the position of the National school teachers in Ireland. It was true there had been; but that statement amounted only to this—that poorly and badly off as the teachers were today, there was a time when they were much worse off. He would make the British Government a present of that argument. A more rapid and substantial increase in the cost of education and in the payment of those engaged in it had been made in England, and that fact should not be left out of mind when they considered the question of increasing the emoluments of the Irish teachers as was proposed. He had been struck from time to time, when they came to discuss questions of this kind, with the fact that the Government of this country, in dealing with Ireland, was very liberal when the question before it was that of paying the police, or the soldier, or the informer. They thought very little then of a few thousands of pounds; but once ask them to spend anything on the wise work of education, on the enlightenment of the young, and on the training of the children of the country, and they found that the hand was closed and the heart was hard. The amelioration of the condition of the Irish teachers had been slow. This was said to be an age of progress; but the progress made in this direction had really been very slight—it had been the progress of the snail, and was truly unworthy of a Government calling itself liberal and enlightened—a Government which, however, had so large an arrear of justice to pay to the Irish people in this matter of education as well as on other subjects. Almost every class in Ireland which had to deal with the Government, except the police and the lawyers, found itself treated in a niggardly and unjust spirit in that House, and the only result was discontent on every hand. He would ask the Government what they could gain by fixing in the minds of the National teachers, who were a very important class in Ireland, a feeling of discontent? What could they gain by allowing their grievance—an acknowledged grievance, a pressing one—to remain so long unredressed? They had heard just now from the right hon. Gentleman that some improvement was to be made in the matter of pensions to these teachers. That was all very well so far; but he thought they would prefer increased pay rather than increased pensions. A pension was a long way off from many of these men. Many of them would never get a pension at all; and, in the meantime, they were all living upon starvation salaries. He believed it would be very much more to the advantage of these people, and very much more agreeable to them, if some increase and advantage in the way of pay were given to them rather than that the boon of these pensions, after a service of 40 years, should be held out to them; for, as he had said, many of them could not hope to obtain the pension, and many of them never would. Irish Members asked for these people simply that a measure of justice should be dealt out to them. It was acknowledged that they were not treated justly—that they were placed at a disadvantage as compared with their brothers and sisters in the same profession in England; and the natural consequence of that state of things was that this important class of people in Ireland were discontented, and he might almost say disaffected. If they were disaffected he should think that they had very good reason to show for their state of mind. The question of school books, which had already been treated by the hon. Member for the City of Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor), he would not go into. He would only say in one sentence that he thought the contents of some of those books might with great advantage be less of a literary and more of a utilitarian character. There was a quantity of general literature in those books, a quantity of matter about birds and beasts, and one thing and another, which might very well be left out, and its place supplied with matter of a practical value to young children in Ireland who had their way to make in the world. They were told that there was a great lack in Ireland of technical education; that was perfectly true; and he thought that a good deal of it might be imparted in the second and third school books, and so on up to the sixth. Information of various kinds—information, for instance, bearing upon agriculture—might be imparted in those school books, instead of some of the poetry they were found to contain. The right hon. Gentleman had held out some hope that this question would be dealt with in the near future—that it would be taken into consideration in a somewhat more generous and liberal spirit. It was well to have that promise; but there were promises on the same subject which were made long since, and which were yet unfulfilled. Apparently it mattered very little to the House of Commons or to the Government whether those promises were fulfilled or not; but it was a great matter to the National teachers of Ireland, who were in such a miserable condition, and he thought the Government could hardly do a wiser thing than to fulfil their promises in a large and liberal spirit if it should happen that the power of doing so should be in their hands after the General Election.

MR. DAWSON said, he would impress upon the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary that he ought to look more closely into the Model Schools than he had given the Committee any reason to hope he was likely to do. The Irish

Members had put forward the case that the Model Schools only contained 1-20th of Catholic pupils, whereas they ought to have contained 77 per cent. They had put it to the right hon. Gentleman that those schools had cost £160,000 to build, and that they cost £76,000 a-year to maintain. They had put it the Government that the Royal Commission issued by their Predecessors had declared that the teaching in those schools was inefficient; that the institutions were below the standard, and ought to be abolished. In the absence of the hon. Gentleman who sat on the opposite side of the House (Sir Eardley Wilmot), who was presiding over the Committee for the promotion of Irish Industries, he would put it to the Government whether all the evidence that had been brought before that Committee had not shown the necessity of technical education in Ireland, and had not demonstrated that technical education could not be carried out unless they had technical classes and technical teachers? He had met a lot of teachers in Ireland lately who had said—"Oh! we could teach shoemaking, we could teach carpentering, we could teach anything if you would only pay us for it." They made that declaration notwithstanding that they had no more idea of the subject they professed to be able to teach than they had of legislation. But he would suggest to the Government that they now had an admirable opportunity of establishing technical schools. Let them devote those Model Schools to the purpose. They had them in every county, and the buildings, with their fittings and everything necessary, would serve admirably the purpose of enabling teachers to teach technical education. They could make them normal schools for the teaching of technical subjects. The right hon. Gentleman, in connection with those matters, had shown a kindly spirit and a spirit of inquiry; and he (Mr. Dawson) would urge him to look into the question of those particular Model Schools, and see whether the money spent upon them could not be more usefully applied.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE) said, with regard to the scale of payments which had been alluded to by the hon. Gentleman the Member for King's County (Mr. Molloy), he should have no objection to show the figures on which the Returns he had quoted were arrived at. He should be glad to give hon. Members opposite who might apply for it every information on this subject in his power. With regard to Model Schools, he could assure hon. Gentlemen that he would give their suggestions every possible consideration. The discussion had now travelled over a very large radius; and considering the period of the Session at which they had arrived, and their position altogether, he appealed to hon. Gentlemen to allow the Vote to be taken without further debate.

MR. SEXTON said, he would renew the Motion he had made at an earlier stage of the day's proceedings to reduce the Vote as a protest against the monopoly in the purchase and sale of books, his contention being that the trade should no longer be hampered by the keeping up of that monopoly.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That the Item of £37,150 for Books and School Apparatus be omitted from the proposed Vote."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

MR. LYNCH said, that, in compliance with the expressed wish of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary, he certainly would not detain the Committee. The subject, though a very important one, had occupied a considerable amount of time—though not more than it deserved—and had been thoroughly well discussed. He certainly felt that the subject of the grievances of the National School teachers of Ireland was one of the most important questions which could be brought forward. He wished to say that he, accompanied by the senior Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), had recently received a deputation—a deputation presided over by Canon MacDermott, on which occasion the teachers put forward their case most clearly. He had promised them, and he was now fulfilling his pledge, to join with his hon. Colleague in protesting against the conduct of the Government in refusing or delaying to remedy the grievances which the teachers had been labouring under so long and so painfully. He trusted the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary would comply with the wishes so unanimously expressed by the Irish teachers. Having said that, he would not detain the Committee any longer.

MR. BIGGAR said, that before the Vote was put he should like to say just a word or two. He had listened with great attention to the speeches which had been made in the course of the discussion, and also to the reply of the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary. The right hon. Gentleman had been very cautious, and properly so perhaps, in not committing himself to any opinion. He (Mr. Biggar) would draw attention to complaints which had been made with regard to one or two points. One was with reference to the compulsory taxation of the Irish ratepayers for technical purposes. He believed that when the School Board system was introduced into Great Britain it was understood that the rate would never reach more than 3*d.* in the pound.

The CHAIRMAN (Sir Arthur Otway) said, he did not wish to ask the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) to repeat the process he had gone through earlier in the day, when he had withdrawn his Amendment in order to enable hon. Members to speak on the general question. He would point out, however, that the remarks of the hon. Member (Mr. Biggar) were not germane to the Amendment. If the Committee desired the hon. Member to continue he (the Chairman) should not object.

Mr. SEXTON said, that it would be open to the hon. Member to continue his remarks if a division were taken upon the Amendment with regard to the item for books.

Mr. BIGGAR said, that if the Committee would bear with him, he would not detain them more than a moment or two. He had been saying that when the School Board system was first introduced into this country assurances were given that the rate would not be more 3*d.* in the pound; but the result had shown that that calculation was altogether erroneous, the rate having been, in some cases, as much as 10*d.* in the pound, the tendency being still to increase year after year. It would be seen, therefore, that it would be extremely dangerous to introduce a scheme of such elastic taxation in Ireland. If such a scheme were introduced the Local Authorities would be continually urged to give increased salaries, and the result would be a serious burden upon the ratepayers. As to these Model Schools, he would repeat what he had said before, and what he believed to be the case—namely, that the great misfortune with regard to English grants was that the Government for the time being always insisted upon the money being foolishly spent. Something like £40,000 a-year was spent on the Model Schools. That money was almost thrown away, and yet if that amount had been given to the masters and devoted to the cause of education generally the result would have been most beneficial. Such an expenditure as that he suggested would have been satisfactory not only to the masters, but to the whole of the Irish people. If he might offer a suggestion to the Government as to a means of utilizing the Model Schools he would propose that they should be disestablished and disendowed as educational institutions, and should be used for the future as police barracks. A large amount was spent upon the building of police barracks in Ireland, and he thought it would be a wise and economical and highly satisfactory arrangement to devote the money spent on those barracks to the purposes of education, and to hand over to the police the Model Schools. There was a system now in vogue by which the grants made by Parliament were increased in proportion to the amount of what were called local payments. The schoolmasters, as a matter of course, puffed up their statements with regard to the amount of local assistance they got in order to obtain as large a grant from the public Exchequer as they could. The system was a very objectionable one, as it not only demoralized the schoolmasters, but placed a burden upon the Imperial Exchequer which it was not entitled to bear. If the Exchequer was to give money it should know exactly what it was giving it for, and money should not be granted under a subterfurge of this kind. Besides, the system was objectionable from the master's point of view, in this way—that by large amounts being put down as local payments it caused the Government and the public to imagine that the masters were much better paid than was really the case. The masters reported that they got from outside sources much more than they really did receive, and that amount and the Imperial grant were put together, and it was supposed to be the sum the masters received as payment for their services. The amount so arrived at, as a matter of fact, was much more than the masters put into their pockets. The system was a vicious one, and it seemed to him to require remedy. Take it for all in all, he thought that the increased grant should depend upon result fees, and the payments should be made in this way, irrespective of what was received from the localities. Under the present system, in the districts where the people were comparatively well off, schoolmasters would be likely to get a much larger sum than they would in poor districts. In districts where the people were poor the master could never get a large sum from the children, nor could he expect to get large subscriptions from the outside public. In this way, therefore, it was just in those districts where the money was most required that the smallest grant was obtained. The system, altogether, was a most objectionable one; and it would be well for the Government, in any new scheme that was formulated, to effect a remedy.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 26; Noes 126: Majority 100.—(Div. List, No. 255.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Class V.—Foreign and Colonial Services.

(2.) £24,690, to complete the sum for South Africa and St. Helena.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Colonel Stanley): I think, probably, I can save the time of the Committee by rising at once, in connection with this Vote, to make a few observations by way of explanation. It seems to be supposed by some hon. Members that I am going to make a general statement in regard to South Africa; but I do not find myself in a position to do that at the present time. I hope the Committee will understand that at the present moment we find ourselves, so to speak, in an intermediate position of affairs. The Expedition which was sent out to South Africa by the late Government, under the command of Sir Charles Warren, has, I am happy to say, fulfilled the primary duties expected of it. Under that able Commander it has fulfilled these duties without bloodshed, and in a manner which seems to have carried out most efficiently the objects for which it was sent out. Sir Charles Warren, I think it may be fairly said, has, by the manner in which he has performed his task, added to the lustre that already attached to his name. On the other hand, I must not be allowed to pass by this subject without one word of commendation of the present High Commissioner at the Cape, who has discharged his duties towards Her Majesty's Government with great loyalty and fidelity, and under circumstances of somewhat considerable difficulty. Speaking as I do in the present state of affairs, I am sorry to say that I am unable to offer to the Committee any very definite information with regard to the immediate future. I think I have led the Committee to believe that I am not likely to make a statement of any very startling character; and, even if I had no other reason for it, this consideration would greatly weigh with me—that in all these matters we require to proceed as calmly and dispassionately as possible. If I endeavour to lay my hand on what seems to me to have been a special fault of our South African policy in times past, it seems to me to have been this—that it has been a policy of vacillation, and that the hot fit of sending out Expeditions has, on the other hand, almost inevitably been succeeded by the cold fit of returning and leaving the Colony to its own devices. Therefore, for all these reasons I hope that in the course of the next few months we may proceed with care and moderation; that we may take the situation as we find it; and that we may make the best of it, endeavouring simply to promote, as far as we can, the welfare of the people who are placed under our rule. Endeavouring, without necessarily adhering in all details to the policy of our Predecessors, and without, on the other hand, attempting anything in the nature—which I should be sorry to attempt—of a policy of reversal, but acting on the information which we are in the course of receiving almost daily, I hope we may approach this great question in the manner which it deserves, and deal with it in a mode which may offer for the future some reasonable assurance that these questions will not be dealt with in the spasmodic manner in which, unfortunately, they have been dealt with heretofore. Well, Sir, this Vote is of great importance, and the questions which will arise in connection with it are of the very widest possible description. In the course of an answer which I gave to a Question the other day, it was my duty to say that an offer had been made of the cession of a vast and rather undefined piece of territory North of the Protectorate. Upon that matter I am bound to say that I think it extremely desirable for the Government to act with extreme care. We have learned a bitter lesson by those vague extensions of undefined territory; and it is by no means clear that the offer, however liberal it may appear to have been under the circumstances in which it was made, is one which the Government could at all be disposed to accept without the very gravest consideration, not only as to immediate, but as to future consequences. Still, Sir, it would be to defeat the very object for which I rose if I went into details on this matter. This I can say—Sir Charles Warren's Expedition, having primarily established order on the boundaries, and having dispossessed those who, without authority, had occupied the land in the Protectorate, has now achieved its first purpose; and acting in conjunction with the High Commissioner, and with Sir Charles Warren himself, we look forward, not to the entire abolition of this Force, but to its early diminution, and to the substitution, as far as may be, of the force of Regular soldiers now there, by a body of police, more suitable for the work to be done. This, of course, can only be carried out gradually and after consultation with those authorities who, being upon the spot, are best able to judge of the special necessities of the case; and I am not without hope that some of those who are in the Force—a great many of them—which has done admirable service, may be induced to form a part of this new Force, thus bringing to the Border work the experience which they have gained in the course of this year's Expedition. I do not think that I shall be guilty of any indiscretion in saying I hope this Force may be placed under the command of an officer who knows the country well, and who has distinguished himself on many occasions—namely, Colonel Carrington. The immediate details of the expenditure do not come within my view; but I am in communication with one of the authorities of the War Office, who I have every reason to trust. I am informed that, so far as present knowledge goes, it is not likely that the Vote for which Parliament has been asked will be exceeded. There is, indeed, every reason to hope that the Expedition will be brought successfully to an end within the amount Parliament has voted. Of course, we do not lose sight of the importance of reducing, as early as possible, the Force which was sent out for a special purpose. It is in no way intended to form that Force into a permanent garrison. We shall do all we can at the present, however, to maintain law and order in the territory of which our troops are in occupation. But as the Committee are aware, arrangements have to be made, not only as regards ourselves, but as regards the Colonies, and especially Cape Colony. The nature of the final arrangements depends so largely upon the action of the Colonial Parliament, however, that I do not think I am in a position to make any definite announcement at this moment. I am sorry I am not in a position to give the Committee at this moment any further information. I beg to assure the Committee that I am in no way anxious to keep anything back.

MR. EVELYN ASHLEY regretted that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would not be in a position to tell them before the Session came to an end what decision the Government had come to with regard to the ultimate destination of the Protectorate—whether it was to be under Imperial or Colonial Government; still he was fully aware of the intricate and difficult nature of the question. He was aware that it was difficult, having regard to the Colonial complications and jealousies, to make any distinct announcement that evening. Still, while it was true that they should avoid spasmodic action in South Africa, he would remind the right hon. and gallant Gentleman that delay often created difficulties which an early settlement might obviate; and he thought this question of the destination of the Protectorate, whether it was under Imperial or Colonial rule, was nearly ripe for settlement. As the Government wished to get the Vote that night, it would be very wrong of him if he obstructed them by entering into a discussion upon South African politics, although he should like to do so under other circumstances. Reference had been made by the right hon. and gallant Gentleman to the Expedition sent out by the late Government. He ventured to claim for that Expedition a very large amount of success. It was an Expedition which had done immense service to South Africa; and although it had cost money, no blood had been spilt, and the money, he ventured to say, had been well spent. The late Government owed their success in that Expedition greatly to the wisdom they showed in the selection of Sir Charles Warren; and, although the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) the other day said that Sir Charles Warren was guilty of great indiscretion, and was totally unfit for the place he occupied, and that his conduct had aroused a bitter feeling in South Africa, he begged, with all due deference to his hon. Friend, to differ from him. There was no doubt Sir Charles Warren had a good deal of the *fortiter in re* not always combined with the *suaviter in modo*; but the Government sent him out as the man who would act *fortiter in re*, and as the man most likely to meet with the favour of the people among whom he had to act. What they must remember was this—that in a half-civilized country, such as he had to deal with, diplomacy and attempts at conciliation were not liked or appreciated. What those races in South Africa liked to feel was that they had a strong man who was just, and who wished to be just; but they did not appreciate any attempts at mere diplomatic conciliation. No doubt, they might find fault with certain expressions he might have used, and on particular occasions he might have kept silence; but he had to contend with an element which was distinctly antagonistic to the work he had to carry forward, and it was only by means of great determination that he was able to fulfil his task. The Boer element in South Africa, however, appreciated his work, and no real ill-feeling had occurred in consequence of his action. He would like to say one word in regard to Sir Hercules Robinson, and what had been said of the disputes between him and Sir Charles Warren. They must all appreciate his services, and he was, without doubt, a most valued servant of the Crown. He might point out, however, that Sir Hercules Robinson, living in Cape Town, and surrounded by antagonistic influences, was not in a position to judge so well as Sir Charles Warren could of the actual necessities of the case, and the bearings of the questions at issue. As to the future, he gathered from the right hon. and gallant Gentleman that he was not hesitating about adopting the Protectorate announced by the late Government, but that he was hesitating — rightly and justly, as he thought—as to whether he should listen to the claims of those who had asked them to go further North to the Zambesi. He would just answer one question which had been put by his hon. Friend the Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell), who had asked why the late Government should extend the Protectorate, pointing out in reference to the trade route that the districts mentioned were nearer to the sea East and West than to the Cape Colony by the trade routes. But let him inform his hon. Friend that the trade routes in this country did not depend on the question as to whether they were distant from the sea or not, but whether there was a supply of water. Her Majesty's late Government therefore found that if they did not take some steps to extend the Protectorate of this country further North than the possessions of Mankoroane and Montsioa, they would be very much in the position of men who went out to ferret rabbits and did not watch the hole. Those freebooters whom they had expelled — not only for the credit and honour of England, but for the benefit of the country—would merely have doubled round and would have gone to attack the persons out of the boundary; and, therefore, they were bound to extend the Protectorate. The question now was, whether that Protectorate was to be maintained by us or handed over to the Cape Colony. He did not pretend to say that the late Government had come to any decision upon that matter before they left Office; they were waiting for information. His own opinion—for what it was worth, and for three years he had been more or less constantly studying South African questions—was that the Cape Colony was absolutely and totally unfit to take charge of the Protectorate. The reasons for saying that he had not time to enlarge upon; but if they wished to render nugatory the Protectorate which had been accomplished, and to render the money they had spent wasted, then they should hand over the Protectorate at once to the Cape Colony. If they wished to reap where they had sown—if they wished to attain, after the trouble and expenditure of the last few years, what he believed they could attain—namely, the consolidation of their Colonial power and authority in South Africa — then he said let them make up their minds for a definite term of years to maintain the Protectorate in their own hands. He did not believe that that would cost a very large amount of money. In the initial stages it might cost something, though not very much; but many of those Native Chiefs were men of considerable wealth and power, and they would be willing to meet the expenses which might be incurred. The working of a Protectorate in a country of that sort preserved a state of peace which would not otherwise exist, and that without any real exercise of force on the part of the protecting Power. It operated to prevent the Native Chiefs from being roused by outsiders to quarrel among themselves, and thus let in the freebooters. He would not delay the Committee longer, and would only say that he hoped the Government would have the courage to reap what had been sown. It was impossible to leave South Africa; and, by giving the Imperial Protectorate for a definite number of years, they would consolidate their power in that country.

Mr. RATHBONE desired to say just a few words of warning as to the course which they seemed to be about to continue in South Africa. The question of South Africa was the most dangerous problem they had to deal with in the whole of their Colonial Empire. They were constantly finding themselves led on either from annexation to annexation or from protectorate to protectorate; and they were, consequently, unable to do justice to themselves in the responsibilities which they were assuming. If they were not very careful they would be liable to have hot fits alternating with cold fits, and both followed by disgrace. South Africa presented a problem that they had not in any other part of their Dominions. In most of their other Colonies or Settlements they had a Native population who disappeared before them; but in South Africa they had to deal with a conquering and vigorous race of Natives and a conquering race of White men, who were just as warlike as we were, and who both increased more rapidly than we could, so that the problem, instead of becoming simpler, was always becoming more difficult; and the danger was that if they went on adding annexation to annexation and protectorate to protectorate, they would be involving themselves in duties which they were unable to perform. He did not wish to say more than that; but he did hope that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman who had charge of the Colonies (Colonel Stanley) would look back at the failures and constantly repeated blunders of successive Governments in South Africa. He was certain that if he would look at the facts of the last 15 years he would see that the blunders alike of Liberal and Conservative Governments had always arisen, not from the wilful adoption of fresh responsibility, but from the attempt to grasp at the more immediate and easy settlement of the questions in dispute without looking at matters all round to see the dangers which such a process inevitably involved.

Mr. CROPPER said, he would not detain the Committee many minutes. His hon. Friend had expressed the usual sentiments which always followed any fresh annexation, and which the Secretary of State for the Colonies no doubt fully appreciated; but he had to deal with a peculiar state of things at present. Sir Charles Warren's Force had been constructed in the very best way for governing the races with which it was to deal; and he trusted that they would hear from the right hon. and gallant Gentleman that the Government was prepared to carry out the spirit of the undertaking which was entered into a year ago by the Liberal Government. He trusted also that they would not dissolve the armed Force that had been sent out, but would be able to constitute from it at a reasonable cost a Police Force which would maintain order in the portion of South Africa which had been recently taken under their protection, and which they could not give up. They were morally bound to protect that part of Africa from the incursions of its cruel neighbours. Anyone who had read the Blue Book would see that the differences which had occurred, and which had been alluded to, between Sir Charles Warren and Sir Hercules Robinson, were not of such a nature to reflect discredit on either of them, and practically occurred owing to the peculiar nature of the position to which Sir Charles Warren was appointed. He was bound to say that, if anyone read the Blue Book carefully, he would see that there was no reason why Sir Charles Warren should not continue to be a very effective officer, who, no doubt, would in a short time regain the good opinion of his superior at the Cape. He thought that if they were to retain that country in any degree, it must be retained under their own protection, and that might, he trusted, be done at a comparatively small cost. It was interesting to learn that Sir Hercules Robinson himself thought that 200 mounted police would be sufficient to maintain order. That might be too small a force to do the work; still, it was Sir Hercules Robinson's opinion. It was interesting, also, to find that Sir Charles Warren thought that if only the importation of ardent spirits could be kept out of the country he would be able to obtain from the Natives a large contribution towards the expenses of Government. One word more with regard to their opponents there. In a letter which he wrote on April 7 Sir Charles Warren stated that there were numbers of the marauders, both Boers and English, hanging about in the neighbourhood, only waiting until the troops left to recommence their marauding. Well, he hoped that the Secretary of State for the Colonies would remember that, and that England would not again be disgraced in the face of the world by a vacillating policy; for no Government was so bad, so cruel, or so injurious to any nation which it came across, as the Government of a Christian, a civilized, and a strong Power, which was at one time influenced by a hot fit and at another by a cold fit in its Colonial policy, which was weak to-day and strong to-morrow, and, by its tyranny and vacillation combined, exhibited its incompetency for government. He trusted the Government now in power, whether they held the reins of Office for a long or a short period, would show that they had some appreciation of what had been intrusted to them, and would sooner or later, when the hour came, hand these interests back in the same state in which they received them.

Sir JOHN LUBBOCK quite understood that they were not likely to hear any very startling announcement from the right hon. and gallant Gentleman; but, at the same time, he thought they should have heard something a little more definite. There were two diametrically opposite policies open to them in South Africa—the policy of prudence and the policy of extension. For his part, he had hoped that they had done with the policy of extension, which had cost so many millions of money, and such a vast quantity of blood. Surely they should remember the enormous responsibilities this country had already undertaken. He confessed that he felt more anxious on the subject in consequence of the able speech recently delivered by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) in which he advocated still more interference in South African affairs. For his part, he hoped that would not be done. The arguments now put forward might be used to urge further and further annexations. The right hon. Gentleman expressed his opinion that if they did not go further they would inevitably lose the Cape Colony altogether. On the contrary, he thought that their interference in those matters was tending to alienate the Colonists, and that the more they avoided those complications the more surely they would retain the loyalty and good feeling of the Cape. He regretted the assumption of a Protectorate over Bechuanaland; it seemed a repetition of their action in the matter of the Transvaal; but, at any rate, he hoped that the present Government concurred in the policy of their Predecessors—namely, that—

> "Her Majesty's Government continued to consider it desirable to bring Bechuanaland and Kalahari under the control of the Colony as soon as possible, due provision being made for Native interests, and that Parliament has advanced a railway loan in confidence that no minor differences could make the Colony hesitate to accept Sir Charles Warren's arrangements."

The reply of the Cape Ministers was far from re-assuring. They declined to commit themselves, and appeared very reluctant to take over the country. Nor could they wonder that the Cape officials should be reluctant to take over Bechuanaland. Sir Hercules Robinson told them on the 23rd of March that though there might be much to be said in favour of a Protectorate—

> "Let it be clearly understood that it will cost the British taxpayers £120,000 a month, while the present Expedition remains in the country, and thereafter not less than £250,000 per annum."

He must confess that he deeply regretted a policy which would cost them £250,000 a-year, varied by probably a war with the Boers every four or five years. If anything could lose them their Cape Colony he believed that would do so, as it could not but create very angry feelings between their Representatives and the Dutch population. The right hon. Member for Bradford had expressed the opinion that it would be, on the whole, better if the Cape Colony did not take over Bechuanaland. His right hon. Friend spoke with great weight, and it was with extreme diffidence that he ventured to express an opposite opinion. They must remember, however, that the responsibilities of the country were already enormous, and they ought not to be extended without very strong reasons. Did any such reason exist? In the first place, whatever might be the case as regarded Mankoroane, there was not a shadow of responsibility on their part towards the Chiefs further North. But even as regarded Mankoroane he was not prepared to admit any liability on our part. Sir Hercules Robinson gave the following summary of the events which led to the recent troubles:—

> "In the early part of November, 1881, Mankoroane, assisted by a few White Volunteers, attacked Massouw, captured some cattle, burnt a village, and retreated to Taungs, his head station. Both sides then enlisted White Volunteers. Massouw's Volunteers greatly outnumbered those obtained by Mankoroane, and after a year's fighting, in which Massouw was victorious, a peace agreement was signed, by which a large tract of country belonging to the two Chiefs was granted to the White Volunteers on both sides."

Mankoroane, therefore, appeared to have been the aggressor. As regarded the settlement, there might be some doubt whether the Chiefs had not exceeded their powers; but even if we set everything right Sir Charles Warren himself admitted that matters would soon go wrong again. The whole question was full of difficulty. They had, on the one hand, an energetic and warlike population thirsting for more land, and, on the other, a number of Native Chiefs belonging to different races, and often quarrelling among themselves. If they set themselves to act the part of police throughout South Africa they were undertaking a Herculean task, and one which would severely task all the resources of the Empire. Moreover, Sir Charles Warren seemed to be taking no steps whatever to raise any revenue in Bechuanaland. When he was asked by Sir Hercules Robinson on the subject he seemed quite surprised. He said on the 2nd of April—

> "You refer to your not having yet received an estimate of revenue for the year; I can find no record of revenue having been mentioned before. My instructions contain no mention as to raising revenue. From whom do you propose that I should obtain the revenue?"

It was very ominous that Sir Hercules Robinson evidently doubted whether Sir Charles Warren was really endeavouring to carry out the views of the Home Government. Writing to Sir Charles Warren, he said—

> "Your concluding observations appear to indicate your disapproval of the policy of Colonial control desired by Her Majesty's Government, and your unwillingness to assist in furthering it."

Sir Hercules Robinson appeared to have acted with great tact and judgment. It was very unfortunate that such serious differences should have arisen between him and Sir Charles Warren; but it was even more serious that Sir Charles Warren's relations should be so strained not only with the Transvaal, but also with our own Colony. He observed with regret that Sir Charles Warren accused the Cape Ministers of being—

> "In sympathy with the filibusters, that they favour the Revolutionists, and refuse assistance to those who ask for peace and order."

While, on the other hand, the Cape Government stated that—

> "In view of the imputations cast upon the inhabitants of this Colony and upon Ministers by Sir Charles Warren, they declined to attach any weight to the representations of that officer."

The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford deprecated any action which could possibly tend to alienate the Cape; but surely the existence of such relations between our own Colonial Government and our Commissioner was likely to weaken the connection between the Colony and the Mother Country. While such a feeling existed, any satisfactory arrangement must be very improbable. Her Majesty's late Government appeared to have been still in favour of the annexation of Bechuanaland to the Cape Colony. In the closing sentences of the Blue Book they said—

> "Her Majesty's Government have no intention of creating a Crown Colony in Bechuanaland; continue to wish that Cape Colony should,

if willing to do so, assume management of Protectorate without delay. They, therefore, request you to obtain information whether, and under what arrangement, the Colonial Government will now propose to Parliament annexation of so much territory as it considers it desirable to include in Colony, and protection of remainder of Protectorate."

He trusted that the present Government intended to act on the same policy. The question was one of great difficulty, and could only be solved satisfactorily if their Representatives acted cordially together, and as far as possible in sympathy with their Colonial fellow-subjects. He was glad to see that Sir Hercules Robinson was on friendly terms with the Cape Government. On the other hand, it was most unfortunate that the relations between Sir Charles Warren and the Cape Colony were far from friendly. In the meantime, while they were unable to meet their expenditure at home, and were compelled to borrow £4,000,000, they were spending hundreds of thousands in this remote region for no definite object or purpose. He trusted that the Government would be able to say that the relations between Sir Hercules Robinson and Sir Charles Warren were more harmonious; to give some assurance that steps were being taken to put an end to the large expenditure of which the British taxpayer had great reason to complain, and the advantage of which to the Native tribes was, after all, very doubtful; and last, but not least, that they would not, without most careful consideration, commit us to any further responsibilities in South Africa.

Mr. LYULPH STANLEY said, he thought they were entitled to have some definite statement from the Government on this question. Although it was late in the Session, and they were all anxious to see their way to leave Westminster for a time, this was a very much more important matter than holiday making. If the Government were not prepared to give the explanation he would move to report Progress.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he hoped the hon. Member would not persevere in his Motion. It was on account of the importance of this matter that his right hon. and gallant Friend was not able to make a more definite statement. If hon. Members were anxious for further information, and thought it could properly be given after they had considered the remarks of his right hon. and gallant Friend, they would have an opportunity of asking for it on the Report.

Mr. COURTNEY, upon that suggestion, considered they should be told when the Report would be taken. If it was to be taken at a reasonable hour, he saw no reason why the Vote should not be allowed to pass.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: We will take it at as early an hour as possible.

Vote *agreed to.*

REVENUE DEPARTMENTS.

(3.) £4,254,659, to complete the sum for the Post Office.

CIVIL SERVICE ESTIMATES.

Class I.—Public Works and Buildings.

(4.) £500, Supplementary, Gordon Monument.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: When shall we have an opportunity of discussing this Vote?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: On Report.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: When?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: To-morrow.

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

NAVY AND ARMY EXPENDITURE, 1883-4.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

1. *Resolved*, That it appears by the Navy Appropriation Account for the year ended the 31st March 1884, as follows, viz.:—

(a.) That the gross expenditure for certain Navy Services exceeded the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £142,114 13*s.* 9*d.*, as shown in Column No. 1 of the Schedule hereto appended; while the gross expenditure for other Navy Services fell short of the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £242,639 6*s.* 10*d.*, as shown in Column No. 2 of the said appended Schedule, so that the gross actual expenditure for the whole of the Navy Services fell short of the gross estimated expenditure by the net sum of £100,524 13*s.* 1*d.*;

(b.) That the receipts in aid of certain Navy Services fell short of the estimate of such receipts by a total sum of £8,981 13*s.*, as shown in Column No. 3 of the said appended Schedule; while the receipts in aid of other Navy Services exceeded the estimate of such receipts by a total sum of £49,362 18*s.* 6*d.*, as shown in Column No. 4 of the said appended Schedule; so that the total actual receipts in aid of the Grants for Navy Services exceeded the total estimated receipts by the net sum of £40,381 5*s.* 6*d.*;

(c.) That the resulting differences between the Exchequer Grants for the Navy Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz.:—

	£	s.	d.
Total Surpluses ...	250,608	13	4
Total Deficits......	109,702	14	9

2. *Resolved,* That the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application, in reduction of the net charge on Exchequer Grants for certain Navy Services, of the whole of the sums received in excess of the estimated Appropriations in Aid, in respect of the same Services (subject to the subsequent surrender out of Exchequer Grants for Navy Services of the before-recited net sum of £40,381 5*s.* 6*d.*, by which the total of such receipts exceeded the estimate); and have also temporarily authorised the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Navy Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Navy Services.

3. *Resolved,* That the application of such sums be sanctioned.

SCHEDULE.

Number of Vote.	Navy Services, 1883-4, Votes.	Gross Expenditure.		Appropriations in Aid.	
		Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure. 1.	Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure. 2.	Deficiencies of Actual as comprd. with Estimated Receipts. 3.	Surpluses of Actual as comprd. with Estimated Receipts. 4.
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1 ..	Wages, &c. to Seamen and Marines ..	..	34,310 18 6	..	10,964 15 11
2 ..	Victuals and Clothing for ditto	..	20,964 3 4	7,524 15 3	
3 ..	Admiralty Office ..	..	2,313 9 7	716 19 4	
4 ..	Coast Guard Service and Naval Reserves, &c...	..	7,537 3 2	..	90 2 8
5 ..	Scientific Branch ..	..	4,707 13 11	..	1,787 19 6
6 ..	Dockyards and Naval Yards at Home and Abroad	51,704 17 11	..	..	375 14 6
7 ..	Victualling Yards, &c...	..	2,540 18 3	571 0 11	
8 ..	Medical Establishments, &c.	2,797 2 10	..	40 19 11	
9 ..	Marine Divisions ..	..	454 17 9	27 8 0	
10 Sec. 1 ..	Naval Stores	40,556 18 5	..	..	5,221 19 11
Sec. 2 ..	Machinery, Ships built by Contract, &c. ..	..	157,899 15 2	..	1 0
11 ..	New Works, Buildings, Yard Machinery, &c.	..	9,955 0 6	..	475 4 7
12 ..	Medicines and Medical Stores	..	349 8 5	..	3,561 18 10
13 ..	Martial Law, &c. ..	..	957 5 6	..	7 15 10
14 ..	Miscellaneous Services..	4,842 11 10	..	..	1,086 2 1
15 ..	Half Pay, &c. ..	..	648 12 9	78 8 4	
16 Sec. 1 ..	Military Pensions and Allowances.. ..	5,796 9 1	..	..	291 15 3
Sec. 2 ..	Civil Pensions and Allowances	848 1 8	..	22 1 3	
17 ..	Army Department—Conveyance of Troops ..	34,543 13 9	..	..	25,499 8 5
	Amount written off as irrecoverable ..	1,024 18 3			
		142,114 13 9	242,639 6 10	8,981 13 0	49,362 18 6

Net Surplus, £100,524 13 1 Net Surplus, £40,381 5 6

Total sum to be surrendered to the Exchequer ... £140,905 18 7

4. *Resolved,* That it appears by the Army Appropriation Account for the year ended 31st March 1884, and the statement appended thereto, as follows, viz :—

(a.) That the gross expenditure for certain Army Services exceeded the estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £26,927 15*s.* as shown in Column No. 1 of the Schedule hereto appended; while the gross expenditure for other Army Services fell short of the Estimate of such expenditure by a total sum of £291,924 9*s.* 10*d.* as shown in Column No. 2 of the same appended Schedule; so that the gross actual expenditure for the whole of the Army Services fell short of the gross estimated expenditure by the net sum of £264,996 14*s.* 10*d.*

(b.) That the receipts in aid of certain Army Services fell short of the estimate of such receipts by a total sum of £143,877 2*s.* 3*d.* as shown in Column No. 3 of the said appended Schedule; while the receipts in aid of other Army Services exceeded the estimate of such receipts by a total sum of £63,642 8*s.* 3*d.* as shown in Column No. 4 of the said appended Schedule; so that the total actual receipts in aid of the Grants for Army Services fell short of the total estimated receipts by the net sum of £80,234 14*s.*;

(c.) That the resulting differences between the Exchequer Grants for Army Services and the net expenditure are as follows, viz. :—

	£ *s.* *d.*
Total Surpluses ...	258,396 0 6
Total Deficits	73,633 19 8

5. *Resolved,* That the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury have temporarily authorised the application, in reduction of the net charge on Exchequer Grants for certain Army Services, of the sums received in excess of the estimated appropriations in aid, in respect of the same Services, and have also temporarily authorised the application of so much of the said total surpluses on certain Grants for Army Services as is necessary to cover the said total deficits on other Grants for Army Services.

6. *Resolved,* That the application of such sums be sanctioned.

SCHEDULE.

No. of Vote.	Army Services, 1883 - 4, Votes.	Gross Expenditure.		Appropriations in Aid.	
		Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure. 1.	Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure. 2.	Deficiencies of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts. 3.	Surpluses of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts. 4.
		£ *s.* *d.*	£ *s.* *d.*	£ *s.* *d.*	£ *s.* *d.*
1	Pay of the General Staff, Regimental Pay, &c. ..	4,778 13 5	..	..	16,490 14 11
2	Divine Service	1,040 14 10	..	..	1 10 9
3	Administration of Military Law..	598 5 3	..	..	179 12 10
4	Medical Establishment and Services	..	1,335 5 7	..	719 1 3
5	Militia Pay and Allowances	..	4,814 3 1	..	2,515 8 1
6	Yeomanry Cavalry Pay and Allowances ..	316 9 7	..	..	14 9 2
7	Volunteer Corps Pay and Allowances	..	5,736 15 11	..	247 12 10
8	Army Reserve Force Pay and Allowances, &c. ..	..	31,595 19 3	..	4,936 16 4
9	Commissariat, Transport, and Ordnance Store Establishments	7,179 7 7	..	..	715 9 2
10	Provisions, Forage, Fuel, Transport, and other Services	..	106,209 17 4	..	26,877 9 1
11	Clothing Establishments, Services, and Supplies..	..	81,565 4 4	74,094 3 5	
12	Supply, Manufacture, and Repair of Warlike and other Stores	..	16,922 13 10	69,731 5 3	
13	Superintending Establishments of and Expenditure for Works, Buildings, and Repairs at Home and Abroad ..	..	16,073 15 4	..	3,890 9 0
	Carried forward ..	13,913 10 8	264,253 14 8	143,825 8 8	56,588 13 5

SCHEDULE—*continued.*

No. of Vote.	Army Services, 1883 - 4, Votes.	Gross Expenditure.		Appropriations in Aid.	
		Excesses of Actual over Estimated Gross Expenditure. 1.	Surpluses of Estimated over Actual Gross Expenditure. 2.	Deficiencies of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts. 3.	Surpluses of Actual as compared with Estimated Receipts. 4.
		£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
	Brought forward ..	13,913 10 8	264,253 14 8	143,825 8 8	56,588 13 5
14	Establishments for Military Education	..	4,738 12 6	35 5 4	
15	Miscellaneous Effective Services	..	1,392 2 8	..	3,245 16 0
16	Salaries and Miscellaneous Charges of the War Office	..	255 19 3	..	12 16 10
17	Rewards for Distinguished Services, &c.	272 1 11	..	..	275 1 10
18	Half Pay	..	7,767 2 7		
19	Retired Pay, &c. ..	..	1,386 10 8	..	2,883 9 0
20	Widows' Pensions ..	5,806 15 9	..	..	140 9 6
21	Pensions for Wounds ..	1,670 1 6			
	Chelsea and Kilmainham Hospitals:—				
22	In-Pensions ..	..	252 13 0	16 8 3	
23	Out-Pensions ..	..	7,975 5 2	..	268 9 1
24	Superannuation Allowances	..	3,882 9 4	..	227 12 7
25	Militia, Yeomanry Cavalry, and Volunteer Forces, Retired Pay	268 16 5			
	Balances irrecoverable	4,996 8 9			
		26,927 15 0	291,924 9 10	143,877 2 3	63,642 8 3

Net Surplus, £264,996 14 10 Net Deficit, £80,234 14 0

Sum to be surrendered to the Exchequer .. £184,762 0 10

Resolutions to be reported *To-morrow.*

WAYS AND MEANS.

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, the sum of £45,361,227, be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND [SALARIES].

Order for Report thereupon read.

Resolution *re-committed; considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the salary of a Secretary for Scotland, and of any officials who may be appointed under the provisions of any Act of the present Session for appointing a Secretary for Scotland, and of any office expenses which may be incurred thereby.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

MOTIONS.

—o—

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.

Resolutions [28th July] *reported,* and *agreed to*:—Bill *ordered* to be brought in by Sir HENRY HOLLAND and Mr. DALRYMPLE.

Instruction to the gentlemen appointed to bring in the Bill, That they do make provision therein for the appointment of Pubic Works Loans Commissioners.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 254.]

EAST INDIA, ARMY PENSIONS DEFICIENCY BILL.

On Motion of Sir HENRY HOLLAND, Bill to provide for the discharge of the liability of the Consolidated Fund in respect of certain Indian Army Pensions, *ordered* to be brought in by Sir HENRY HOLLAND and Colonel WALROND.

Bill *presented*, and read the first time. [Bill 255.]

ADJOURNMENT.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House do now adjourn."—(*Sir Henry Holland.*)

MR. H. H. FOWLER desired to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer a question as to the prospects for to-morrow. Would the right hon. Gentleman allow the Criminal Law Amendment Bill to come before the Telegraph Bill? The Criminal Law Amendment Bill was of the greatest possible interest, and he ventured to hope the right hon. Gentleman would allow it to be taken to-morrow.

MR. SEXTON asked whether the Report of Supply would be taken first thing?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH), in reply, said, that the Report of Supply would be taken as the first Order to-morrow, as some hon. Members had postponed their remarks that afternoon in order to make them on Report. He was afraid that the Telegraph Bill would also have to come on before the Criminal Law Amendment Bill, because he was under an engagement with regard to it—unless there was a general feeling in the House to the contrary to-morrow.

MR. H. H. FOWLER thought that there would be a very general feeling in the House to-morrow, notwithstanding the expressions of dissent he heard from several Members. The Criminal Law Amendment Bill would take at least two nights in Committee. He was quite sure the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) would be glad to fall in with any arrangement with regard to the Telegraph Bill. He might suggest that if substantial progress was made with the Telegraph Bill, it could be postponed at a reasonable hour to allow the Criminal Law Amendment Bill to be taken,

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, it might be possible.

MR. RAMSAY: Would the right hon. Gentleman state when the Secretary for Scotland Bill will be taken?

[No reply.]

It being Six of the clock the House stood adjourned till To-morrow.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 30*th July*, 1885.

MINUTES.]—*Took the Oath for the First Time*—The Lord Bishop of Truro.

SELECT COMMITTEE—*Fifth Report*—Office of the Clerk of the Parliaments and Office of the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod.

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading* — Customs and Inland Revenue (No. 2)* (220); Lunacy Acts Amendment* (221); Metropolitan Police Staff Superannuation* (222); Patent Law Amendment* (223).

Second Reading—Public Health (Scotland) Provisional Order (No. 2)* (188); Smoke Nuisance Abatement (50); Copyhold Enfranchisement (185), *negatived;* Pluralities (213); Poor Law Unions' Officers (Ireland) (214); Metropolitan Board of Works (Money)* (209).

Committee—Earldom of Mar Restitution (217).

Committee—Report—Medical Relief Disqualification Removal (207); Bankruptcy (Office Accommodation)* (191).

Report — Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt Practices)* (219).

Third Reading — Post Office Sites* (181); Public Health (Members and Officers)* (194), and *passed.*

SMOKE NUISANCE ABATEMENT (METROPOLIS) BILL.—(No. 50.)

(*The Lord Stratheden and Campbell.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL: My Lords, I rise to move the second reading of the Bill on Smoke Abatement. Let me first explain the interval which has elapsed since it was read a first time this Session. Down to the middle of June I was absorbed by questions far more urgent in their character. The course of Parliament was then long interrupted. When it was resumed on the 6th of July, there was little chance of getting such a measure through the House of Commons for the present. If it is only read a second time and goes no further, yet the object of its friends will be promoted. Last Session the Bill was advocated fully on two stages. It was carried on the last by a majority of more than two to one against the strenuous efforts of the late Government, excepting always the noble Duke their Master of the Horse (the Duke of Westminster), who is as much concerned in it as I am. It is chiefly because a number of Peers on either side have lately joined us that I feel bound to give a hurried explanation of it. The Bill starts from the measures of Lord Palmerston, at the time when he was Home Secretary. It contemplates a gradual action on the smoke of private houses, as he directed his enactments against the smoke of large commercial factories in London. It is useless to efface the smoke of large commercial factories if the void is constantly filled up by the new houses which arise with wonderful rapidity. The Statutes of Lord Palmerston are baffled by a steady influx of the evil which they were framed to obviate. It is something like the Sinking Fund. The Sinking Fund is excellent when you have ceased to borrow. But it has been found that there is no good in reducing debt when you are steadily augmenting it. The aggregate of smoke in London must be greater than it was when Lord Palmerston began to operate against it. Beyond that, the Statutes of Lord Palmerston are not enforced with rigour, because it is seen that, even if they were, the evil which they have in view would not be seriously mitigated. Some action, therefore, is required in order to do justice to the legislation of Lord Palmerston. It can only be brought about by the mechanism of local bodies. The householders will not submit to interference except from local bodies which they have helped to form, which they know how to reach, which they are qualified to influence. The leading feature of the Bill is to enable Vestries, through their bye-laws under the direction of the Home Office, to make the evil which prevails illegal for the future. It may be said that, however just the power, it will not be exerted. Possibly it may not. It will turn much upon the pressure of opinion, discussion out-of-doors, the feeling of society. But even if all the local bodies are inactive, by other clauses some good will arise of a subordinate description. The excessive and opaque smoke which at times proceeds from clubs when some unwonted dinner is preparing may be immediately prohibited. The Statutes of Lord Palmerston will operate over a wider area than hitherto they have done. The Metropolitan Board of Works will gain a further jurisdiction over the heating apparatus of new houses, which, as 25,000 are added every year, become a vast ingredient in a formidable problem. I contended last year, and I hold still, that the discretionary power of the local bodies will be exerted in the City, even if elsewhere it is latent. The Lord Mayor of the day may easily obtain its application, and there are many influences well known to the House by which a Lord Mayor may be urged into activity for any object which is just and irreproachable. Some few objections ought, perhaps, to be encountered. It has been urged that mechanical invention is not advanced sufficiently for restraining smoke in private houses. But this impression wholly overlooks the history of the subject. Last year I pointed to seven methods by which the object may be compassed. For 100 years the scientific world has been employed upon the subject. In 1785 the well-known author of the steam engine, James Watt, took out a patent with regard to it in furnaces. There is no more reason that London should be enveloped as it is than any other capital of Europe. The use of coke and wood, or coke and gas, or coke alone, with a little alteration of existing fire-places to increase the draught, would be sufficient for the object. The late Sir William Siemens is the master we should look to. The noble Duke the Chairman of the Institute on Smoke has also tried experiments by which the public may be guided. In some quarters it is feared that the liberty of the householder would be improperly encroached upon. On the contrary, he would enjoy a greater latitude and more authority than he does at present. He is now confined, not by law, but custom, which is infinitely stronger to the use of raw coal in ordinary fire-places. Whenever he departs from it—as there is no necessity to do so—his family and servants are nearly certain to oppose him. I knew a householder, some years ago, conversant with the question, who introduced the Arnott stove throughout his mansion, except the kitchen, where, of course, it was most needed, but where the opposition was too serious to deal with. When this Bill is carried, and when his local body acts upon it, the householder will be armed by law; he will pull himself together; he will compare the different modes of heating which exist; he will form a sound and prudent choice between them, and insist on the necessity of quitting the old routine from which for years he has vainly struggled to release himself. But there was one objection mentioned by my noble Friend the Chairman of Committees, that as some local bodies would apply the law, while others did not, smoke might be legal on one side of a street and illegal on the other. But even if it was the case the atmosphere would gain a little. Where it was not corrected no new hardship would arise. Can it be doubted that the action of the defaulting body would be hastened, that both sides of the street would soon be under the enactment on the old principle, *Cum proximus ardet*. But the objection of the late Government, which forced a division on the House last year, has vanished altogether. It was that the whole subject ought to be referred to a huge central body which the late Government proposed to organize. In vain it was demonstrated that such a jurisdiction could not act on smoke at all, because it would have no proper title to fix an area for the experiment, and would not venture to impose restraint upon the whole of the Metropolis together. Nothing would satisfy the Government of that day except leaving smoke to the repression of a colossal power which was not certain to arise, and could not venture to repress it. To encroach upon the privileges of that gigantic form was inconsistent with the tenderness which it inspired even before its parturition was effected. The late Government were haunted by it. We have heard of a celebrated novel called *Frankenstein*, by Mrs. Shelley. Frankenstein was overpowered and entangled by the monster he had too ambitiously created. He did not turn pale before the imagined dignity and hypothetical austerity of the monster he was never doomed to call into existence. It may be urged by some that Vestries are not final, and that new municipal divisions will replace them. Whenever that occurs their powers as to smoke may be easily transferred to the new municipal divisions by which the capital is governed. Let me run over very briefly the positive advantages which the measure aims at. One is, of course, the greater purity of domiciles. Smoke is now destructive of furniture, of linen, of dresses, and many other thing which womanhood appreciates. Another is the sanitary benefit. You cannot leave with prudence, in constantly deteriorating air, the masses you are striving to transfer to better habitations. As to architecture, I will not now repeat what I have dwelt upon before; but wish to make this observation. Unless smoke is overcome you cannot have the colour you desire for edifices which are rising. The influence of smoke on architecture is too extensive and minute a topic to be handled at this moment. There is but one opinion among experts of its consequences. Of course, it may be argued that the Bill can never reach the Statute Book this Session. The object is, by the unanimous concurrence of the House, to facilitate the task of Governments in afterwards adopting it. It is not in all respects desirable that Bills should become Acts—even if they can—unless a Government proposes them. Governments are forced by a political necessity which grew up after the first Reform Act—whether they like or not—to offer legislation to the country. If the material of proper legislation is consumed—it cannot be unlimited—they are driven to schemes revolting to themselves and prejudicial to the country. It is sufficient for the framers of the present Bill to lay before them a path which is not either dangerous or unprofitable. I therefore ask your Lordships to repeat the step which a year ago you had the goodness to decide on. I will now move the second reading of the Bill.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Lord Stratheden and Campbell.*)

THE PAYMASTER GENERAL (Earl BEAUCHAMP) said, that since the 19th of March this Bill has been slumbering peacefully on the Orders as a Bill that awaited the second reading, and it was not until Tuesday last that the second reading was put down for this day. In these circumstances it could scarcely have received adequate consideration from their Lordships. He supposed the noble Lord did not intend to proceed any further with it this Session; at any rate, if he did intend to do so, it would be his (Earl Beauchamp's) duty to point out the many grave defects which existed in the Bill. Everyone would sympathize with the object of the Bill, which was to limit waste and extravagance in the consumption of coal, because they were injurious to health and property; but it was another question whether the machinery of the Bill was the best adapted for the purpose. That, however, was a point into which they need not now stop to inquire. He would recommend that it be read a second time, and that the Order for Committee should be discharged and the Bill withdrawn.

LORD MOUNT-TEMPLE said, that their Lordships would be unanimous on the point that smoke was a nuisance in London, and it was a reflection on our civilization that so little had been done to diminish it. It was a mistake to suppose that the unconsumed coal which floated in the air we breathed and the dismal pall of smoke which hung over London was inevitable. Mechanical science had made such advance that there was now no difficulty in preventing the pollution of the atmosphere by smoke, and it was a wrong upon the public that individuals should have unlimited power to injure themselves and others by negligently contributing to the nuisance. Moreover, there was a great waste of carbon, which might be economized and utilized by mechanical science. This Bill provided amendments of the law worthy of the deliberate consideration of their Lordships in the next Session.

LORD STRATHEDEN AND CAMPBELL said, that in reference to what had fallen from the noble Earl on the Treasury Bench he would have willingly exposed the Bill to the ordeal of a Select Committee, to give it greater accuracy and precision, although it was not carelelssly drawn up, had there been time for such a process. As things stood he did not wish it to go beyond the second reading for the present, and he trusted that their Lordships would see no reason to depart from the conclusion they had previously arrived at.

Motion *agreed to:* Bill read 2ª.

COPYHOLD ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

(*The Lord Hobhouse.*)

(NO. 185.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD HOBHOUSE, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that the measure was one of a series of steps which had been taken by the advice of eminent lawyers and statesmen, men who in other departments of public life entertained the most divergent opinions, but who agreed in this—that it was desirable as fast as possible to diminish, and finally extinguish, the old inconvenient tenure of copyhold. Great and serious evils arose from this tenure. In the first place, there was a multiplicity of laws, not written and not generally known, and only ascertainable by tradition, which this system created. These laws could only be ascertained on the oral evidence of persons cognizant of the customs of each particular manor. The question was inquired into for the first time in 1832 by a body of eminent lawyers, who dealt with the whole subject of real property. The Report of these gentlemen recapitulated the evils arising from the immense variety of customs in different manors, customs to be sought in oral traditions, and the Court Rolls which had often been kept by ignorant or negligent stewards. They remarked that it was not surprising that frequent litigation arose between lord and tenant, vendor and purchaser, and the vendor and others claiming an adverse interest to the vendor. It had been suggested that the true remedy for these evils lay in the adoption of a general registry of titles in England. But these, though perhaps the most obvious, were not the greatest evils. The greatest was the system of arbitrary fines on each devolution of the copyhold interest and occasionally also of the freehold title. The lord might require the copyholder to pay two years' improved value of the land. That system was obviously, and, in fact, had been found to be, a serious obstacle to the improvement of land. In the same Report from which he had quoted, he found remarks on the check to improvements occasioned by the conflicting rights of landlord and tenant, and the consequent diminution of the public wealth, and the direct discouragement to agriculture and the erection of buildings. Remarkable evidence was taken also by the Committee which reported on the subject in 1852. In that evidence were some striking statements of one of the Drainage Commissioners on the unwillingness of copyholders to borrow money for drainage. This gentleman expressed an opinion that copyhold lands were worse cultivated than freehold. He was talking the other day to a veteran solicitor and steward of a manor, who said that he could tell by simple inspection which were copyhold and which freehold lands. Then the tenure discouraged the growth of timber, for if the lord cut the timber it was trespass against the tenant, and if the tenant cut it was waste against the lord. Thus no young timber was allowed to grow on copyhold land. Thus in Sussex copyhold land could be recognized by the entire absence of trees on one side, while there was on the other a well-wooded area. Then there were heriots. The lord might on alienation take his tenant's best chattel —in some cases it was his best live chattel. Very startling and, in some cases, amusing stories were told of the devices resorted to by tenants to induce their lord to take the worst instead of the best chattel. These evils were aggravated in many instances by the confusion of boundaries between freehold and copyhold land. It frequently happened that when land had been held continuously for many years part of the same field was copyhold and part freehold without any distinction which was which. But the occupier was afraid of tilling the field to the best advantage because he might by his method of cultivation incur a a forfeiture of the copyhold portion. Then, too, it often became necessary to make both a freehold and copyhold conveyance of the same land, and the tenant dare not grow timber for fear of forfeiture. These insuperable objections existed in the case of purchase because the vendor could not point out the boundaries between the copyhold and the freehold. All these inconveniences were especially felt in the counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex. The Real Property Commissioners did not advise any compulsory action. In 1838 the matter was referred to a very strong Committee of the House of Commons, which recommended that a compulsory measure should be passed. The result of the recommendation of that Committee was the passing of the Copyhold Act of 1841, and the Legislature appeared to have followed the recommendation of the Committee by trying in the first instance what he might call the voluntary system. A Copyhold Commission, which was still at work, was established, and was empowered to receive applications for enfranchisement and to give effect to them in cases when the lord of the manor and the tenant were agreed on the subject. In 1851 the matter was again referred to a Select Committee of the House of Commons, and they reported to the effect that it was highly desirable that the entire enfranchisement of copyhold estates should be effected as soon as possible, due regard being had to the rights and claims of all parties, and that such enfranchisement should be compulsory on all. In 1852 a measure was passed enabling one of the parties to demand enfranchisement instead of requiring the consent of both. That Act, however, applied only to cases where the admission had taken place after the 3rd of July, 1853. The principle of that Act was found to be very beneficial, and the number of enfranchisements considerably increased. In 1858 another Act was passed which took away the restriction as to time and made the Act of 1852 apply to every copyhold in the Kingdom. Their Lordships might ask what had been the practical effect of this legislation. He held in his hand a Return made by the Land Commissioners down to 1882 which showed the operation of the various Acts. As long as the Act of 1841 or the voluntary system was prevalent the average number of enfranchisements was 42 a-year. When the Act of 1852 came into operation the average rose to 243 a-year, and when the Act of 1858 came into operation, taking it down to the present time, the average was 554 a-year. Perhaps he might be asked what proportion that was of the whole of the copyholds in the Kingdom, and whether the process of enfranchisement was going on fast or slowly. He was sorry to say that he could not answer that question. He found that no man could answer it. In the absence of registries we had no means whatever of ascertaining what quantity of copyhold land there was in England. Therefore, he could not say whether the proportion of which the enfranchisement had been effected was small or large compared with the proportion which remained. But it was agreed upon by everybody who understood the subject that there still remained a vast number of copyholds throughout England. The Bill now under their Lordships' consideration had been the subject of discussion for four years in the House of Commons, by many public bodies outside it, and by individuals who were interested in the matter; and the measure was, in fact, the work of many hands. It bore, indeed, the marks of that, as it was not quite so clear either in point of arrangement or in point of expression as could be desired. In these respects it was open to some amendment; but he believed their Lordships would consider it to be upon the whole a very valuable measure. It contained a large quantity of legislative details, and if he were asked what was the principle of the Bill he should say that it was a measure to carry into more complete effect the policy of the last 50 years and to promote and accelerate the enfranchisement of copyholds. He had heard this measure described by persons competent to judge of it as one which proposed to deal with the property of two persons in a way which neither of them desired should be followed; but what it did was to place the initiative in the hands of the lord who was required on admitting or enrolling any person as tenant to any land after the 31st of December, 1885, save where the admittance or enrolment took place in consequence of the death of a lord, to give a notice in writing to the tenant of enfranchisement, and the Bill provided that in default of such notice being given no fine, relief, or heriot should be payable to the lord on any subsequent admittance or enrolment. Every such notice of enfranchisement was to be accompanied by an offer to take a certain sum which, if accepted, was to be the compensation; the lord and the tenant were empowered to agree on compensation and to appoint valuers to fix it. Thus if the tenant desired to remain a copyholder all he had to do was to allow the lord's notice to drop. In the event of the lord not serving such notice the tenant might avail himself of the compulsory provisions of the Copyhold Acts. He anticipated that this measure would have a very important effect in enfranchising copyholds, and would benefit the lord, the tenant, and the public. The Bill came before the Incorporated Law Society, and met with their approval. In conclusion, he moved the second reading of the Bill, thanking their Lordships for the great patience with which they had listened to him.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^a."—(*The Lord Hobhouse.*)

LORD BRAMWELL said, that the Bill was not prepared with such consummate skill as his noble and learned Friend would have them believe. He thought no one denied that it was desirable to get rid of the copyhold tenure, and if anyone did doubt it before he could not doubt it after having heard the very convincing speech to which the House had just listened. His noble Friend had shown the great mischief caused by the existing law. There was one evil he had not mentioned. The lord was the owner of the minerals under the surface, whilst the copyholder was the owner of the soil; therefore the lord could not take them, and the copyholder could not take them. This was another reason why this tenure should in some way be got rid of, and most certainly if some benevolent magician could do that with a wave of his wand without expense he did not suppose anyone would be found to object. He did not suppose the lord was desirous of being lord for the mere pleasure of the title. But did it not strike their Lordships that the more the noble and learned Lord showed that it was good to get rid of this tenure the more it followed that there were some difficulties in the way of getting rid of it which made it better for them to put up with it than to go to the expense involved? That, indeed, was the only reason for its existence—it was more troublesome and expensive to get rid of than to keep—the cost would be greater than the benefits derived from enfranchisement. There was a third person interested, and that was the steward, and certainly the Bill would be a boon to the present generation of stewards; and when his noble and learned Friend said that the Incorporated Law Society approved of the Bill he could well understand that, seeing that there was a great number of stewards in the Society. The stewards were most respectable gentlemen, but, like himself, were inclined to think that right which was pleasant. The lord could compel enfranchisement if he pleased; the copyholder could compel it if he pleased; and, therefore, the Bill could only be applicable to the case where both lord and copyholder, each being able to enfranchise, did not choose to do so. In that case the Bill said they should. He should neither affirm nor deny anything about land at the present time. It might very well be that the public was entitled to say that land should be held and dealt with in a way most advantageous to the public; but that could only be done through the individual. Why was it that both lord and tenant were so indifferent that they would not take the benefit which the law at present offered? It must be a peculiarity of the copyholder if he would not follow his own interests. He would tell them why the copyholder left things as they were. The game was not worth the candle, and the noble Lord on the Woolsack would agree with him that the worst of all expensive and wearisome proceedings in which a man could be involved was in the adjustment of parcel or boundary. This was the real reason why advantage had not been taken to a much larger extent of the existing law than had been the case. He wished to know why the provision for the lord having the right of access to his mines, with some arrangement in respect of it, was omitted from this Bill? Such a provision had been in all previous Bills. The Commissioners, whose Report had been quoted by his noble and learned Friend, rejected all plans for the compulsory enfranchisement of copyholds, and since that Report Acts of Parliament had been passed which introduced compulsory enfranchisement upon the application either of the lord or the tenant. The difference between those Acts and the present Bill was that in the case of copyholds which it would not be worth anybody's while to enfranchise the Bill would compel enfranchisement. He had often said if anyone were to make him a present of a piece of land occasionally to be seen by the wayside he would not take it if he had to defend the title, and there were several of those copyholds which he would not take as a gift if there was to be enfranchisement of them. He hoped their Lordships would not read the Bill a second time. The only reason by which the Bill could be justified was on account of some benefit, or supposed benefit, to the public. So far from that, it seemed to be a Bill simply to compel people to do that which they were told was for their good, but which they nevertheless thought was not for their benefit.

EARL STANHOPE said, it was obvious, from the speech of the noble and learned Lord who moved the second reading, that this was a complicated and technical Bill, and being so vast and extensive, containing 54 clauses, it ought to have fuller consideration than could possibly be given it at this time of the Session. If the noble and learned Lord was correct in saying that the object of the Bill was to benefit the lord, the tenant, and the public, he would be the last person to propose to refer it to a Select Committee. But though he had put a Notice of such a Motion on the Paper he really believed that the Bill ought not to be gone on with at the present time. The principle of the Bill was to compel those who did not wish to enfranchise to enfranchise against their will. Speaking on behalf of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, of whom he was one, he thought the Bill contained several objectionable provisions. Besides having presented a Petition carefully prepared from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, he had also presented Petitions from the Dean and Chapter of Carlisle, from Trinity College, Cambridge, King's College, St. John's College, and Pembroke College, Cambridge, against the second reading. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners were among the largest lords of manors in England. They held 450 manors, and notwithstanding the slow progress which was alleged had been made, they had enfranchised over 2,500 copyholds. The noble Lord admitted that the enfranchisements were at the rate of 500 a-year. First of all, the mineral rights of the lords were prejudiced by the Bill, because, though it was true that the minerals could not be worked without the leave of the copyholder, it was undisputed that they belonged to the lords, and the onus of proving the boundaries which hitherto fell on the tenant was thrown on the lord. That would be a very difficult and costly process. Another provision which injuriously affected the lords of manors was contained in a clause which said that the land should be sold at the actual value of the rent or the actual value of the land as it stood. That meant that all the advantage arising from land situated near towns was sacrificed. There was land in the neighbourhood of towns worth £200 an acre, for which the copyholder paid only a small fine, which did not at all represent its value. In fact, that clause would sacrifice the prospective value of building land all over the Kingdom. What was the evidence in favour of the Bill? All the evidence that he could gather was that it had been four years before the House of Commons. But it had never been discussed by the House of Commons. It was true that the Bill was referred to a Select Committee of the House of Commons last year; but that Committee refused to hear evidence whether of the lord or the copyholder, though a measure of such importance ought in all justice to be carefully sifted and weighed by a Committee receiving evidence. The facilities for enfranchisement given by the Acts of 1852 and 1858 had been admitted. The proposal of the Bill was that the parties, whether they liked it or not, should be obliged to enfranchise, and the law charges, the expense of the definition of boundaries, and the cost of notice all fell on the lord. The Bill would also inflict injustice on the tenant. A tenant who paid 6*d.* a-year for his copyhold was to enfranchise whether he liked it or not. He would, under the Bill, be obliged to borrow the money at 4 per cent, or be subject to a rent charge equal to 4 per cent. There were no Petitions from copyholders in favour of the Bill. It was said that the copyholders of Accrington were very desirous that it should pass. Well, let them have a Bill of their own. He did not think anyone could allege that this Bill was likely to receive adequate consideration at the present time, and, therefore, he would take upon himself at once to move that it be read a second time that day three months.

Amendment *moved,* to leave out ("now") and add at the end of the Motion ("this day three months.")—(*The Earl Stanhope.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord HALSBURY) said, he should like to ask the noble and learned Lord who moved the second reading of this Bill whether he would be content that the Bill should be read a second time without sending it to a Select Committee? If he gathered from the noble and learned Lord's observations that he did not desire that it should pass into law before its details were considered, it was obvious that it was absolutely impossible to thoroughly discuss those details this Session. The only object, therefore, in assenting to the second reading was that the House should affirm some principle on which the Bill was supposed to be framed. On that subject it appeared that the noble and learned Lord had not made up his mind as to what was the principle of the Bill. There was considerable doubt as to whether the 1st section made the Bill compulsory or not. What, in effect, it enacted was this, not that it should be compulsory, but that it should, whether the parties liked it or not, commence litigation which would be fruitless. Anything more injurious than such a state of things as that both to lord and tenant he could hardly conceive. He gathered from the noble and learned Lord that the Bill was the product of many minds, that the mode in which it was drawn was open to exception, and that he would not like it to pass into law without going through the ordeal of a Select Committee. By those admissions he judged that the noble and learned Lord would not desire to see this field of litigation thrown open to lords and tenants without a very careful scrutiny being made of the provisions of the Bill. He did not think that the noble and learned Lord dealt satisfactorily with the point that the Bill did not deal with minerals. The answer he gave was that it did not refuse to accept what former Acts had done; and he stated that Bills introduced on the subject had attempted to settle the vexed question of minerals, the state of the law with regard to which was very unsatisfactory. The Bill now before their Lordships, however, did not settle the question, and it would tend to produce heartburning and make people believe that the question as between lord and tenant was settled when it was not. He presumed that their Lordships must make up their minds as to whether this was a compulsory measure or not before the second reading was taken. The noble and learned Lord stated that the lord must, to put the provisions of the Bill in operation, serve the tenant with a notice, but that the tenant might, if he liked, throw the notice behind the fire. If that was the true view of it how did the Bill differ from the law as it stood at the present time? It was not denied that the law might enforce enfranchisements; and if this was only another useless step to create expense it would be very undesirable to read the Bill a second time, and settle nothing by it.

THE EARL OF SELBORNE said, he could not agree with his noble and learned Friend who had just spoken. The measure stated that it was very desirable to get rid of this inconvenient copyhold tenure, which had many disadvantages. He had never heard anyone point out an advantage in connection with copyhold tenure, and the principle of the Bill was that it took another step in the direction of getting rid of it. Were their Lordships going to reject a Bill founded on that principle—a Bill which had received the sanction of the House of Commons, of a Select Committee of the Land Commissioners, and of that branch of the Legal Profession which was conversant with the question? Were their Lordships going to reject the principle of the Bill because there was no time this Session to discuss details. Some of the clauses, no doubt, ought to receive very careful consideration; but he did not think that the House would put itself in a much better position with respect to the question than it now occupied if it affirmed the principle that it was desirable to make progress in the direction of getting rid of this tenure, and also that the details of the measure required consideration. His noble and learned Friend on the Woolsack asked why a Bill of this sort should be proposed when the law already enabled the lord or the tenant to compel enfranchisement. The answer to that was that the present provisions were such that nobody had an interest in putting them in motion except upon particular occasions. If the law could be set in motion in the manner proposed by the Bill they would practically get an important step towards the end which all agreed it was desirable to attain. He would not discuss the details of the measure because if the principle was right the details would have to be considered at the proper time. Everyone admitted that the present state of the law was unsatisfactory. There were minerals which could not be got at, and that was a state of things injurious to the public. Surely the proper course to adopt was to read the Bill a second time in order that the details might be discussed if there were time, and if there were not, that there Lordships might indicate that they were not hostile to the principle of the measure.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Viscount CRANBROOK), said, he was disappointed that the noble and learned Earl who had just spoken had not laid down a principle on which they could vote. All he had said was that the Bill was a step in the direction of enfranchisement. He (Viscount Cranbrook) did not yield to anyone in his objection to copyhold tenures; but this seemed to be one of those Bills which originated in the feeling that something must be done, and then it often was supposed that anything would do. It was a sort of Joseph Surface Bill, full of high sentiments not carried into practice—an illustration of faith without works. The House ought not to be called upon to approve a principle which was not accurately defined by the noble and learned Lord who had introduced the Bill, or by those who had supported it, and to commit themselves to something of which an inconvenient application might be made next year.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that if there was any imitation of Joseph Surface in the matter, it was in fully recognizing that there were evils that called for remedy, and yet in declining to support a measure calculated to diminish those evils. The principle of the Bill had been clearly stated by the noble and learned Lord who moved the second reading. It was admitted that the evils were considerable evils, that the tenure was a bad one, and that there were grave details for discussion in Committee; and no one had impugned the general principle of the Bill, which ought not to be rejected, simply because there might not be time to consider it in Committee.

THE EARL OF FEVERSHAM said, he objected to the Bill as a piece of legislation intended to worry people who wanted to be let alone, and to compel them to enfranchise whether they liked or not. He believed that the Bill would, if passed in its present shape, affect very many rights over considerable tracts of moorland, and to that he objected.

On Question, That ("now") stand part of the Motion?

Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 14; Not-Contents 46: Majority 32.

Resolved in the *negative*.

Bill to be read 2ª on *this day three months*.

PLURALITIES BILL.—(No. 213.)

(*The Lord Bishop of London.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE BISHOP OF LONDON, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that it had already twice passed their Lordships' House. The Bill was intended to remedy the defects of the Pluralities Act of about 50 years ago. In case of the holder of two benefices being unable to provide for the duties of one of them, and being unable to obtain a clergyman to undertake those duties for the stipend offered, the Bishop had now no power to interfere. The Bill would enable the Bishop to appoint a curate in such cases and to assign an adequate salary out of the revenues of the living. When benefices were vacant the Bishop could appoint a temporary curate, but at a salary which no curate would now accept. He had, when Bishop of Exeter, on several occasions himself paid a curate in these circumstances. As the law now stood in Wales, no clergyman could be appointed to the cure of souls who could not preach in Welsh. But the Bishop had no power to order Welsh services to be celebrated. This Bill would enable the Bishop to order that at least one Welsh service should be held on Sundays. In these circumstances he hoped their Lordships would read the Bill a second time.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Bishop of London.*)

Motion *agreed to*; Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

POOR LAW UNIONS' OFFICERS (IRELAND) BILL.—(No. 214.)

(*The Marquess of Waterford.*)

SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that its object was to enable Boards of Guardians in Ireland to give pensions to officers on the abolition of their offices. As the law now stood these Boards could give pensions to their officers on the ground of ill-health or resignation through old age; but they were not able to give pensions in cases where the offices had been abolished. These cases would mainly occur where Unions had to be amalgamated. Where two Unions had to be amalgamated—and there was a prospect of such amalgamation—it would be very hard upon the officers of a Union amalgamated to another Union if they were turned out into the world without pensions. The Bill provided that the Union which was abolished should provide the funds. He thought it only fair that such a Bill should be passed, and he, therefore, moved the second reading.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Marquess of Waterford.*)

Motion *agreed to*; Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow*.

EARLDOM OF MAR RESTITUTION BILL.

(*The Earl of Rosebery.*)

(NO. 107.) COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

Moved, "That the House do now resolve itself into Committee."—(*The Earl of Selborne.*)

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of REDESDALE) said, he was surprised that the noble and learned Earl (the Earl of Selborne) should ask their Lordships to go into Committee on this Bill, which was a wholly unprecedented measure, and was not really a restitution Bill at all. What was at stake with regard to this Peerage? The Bill said—

> "And whereas doubts may exist whether the said ancient honour, dignity, and title of peerage of Earl of Mar, which so descended to the said Isabella, Countess of Mar, was or was not previously to 1565 by any lawful means surrendered or merged in the Crown."

This Peerage had never been represented in Parliament since it became extinguished. The way in which this matter stood was rather peculiar. The gentleman who was to be benefited by this Bill had never applied to the Crown claiming to be entitled to the dignity; but in opposing another person who got the Peerage he refused to have the Peerage described as in this Bill. The Standing Orders of the House were againt this mode of procedure, for they laid down that neither the House nor a Committee should proceed upon any claim to the Peerage until the necessary Petition should have been lodged, along with a statement containing a history of the pedigree and an abstract of the proof and authority upon which the claim was to be founded. In this instance no printed case had been lodged, and the only evidence upon which it stood was what was taken in their Lordships' House, some of it many years ago, so that no one could have gone through it without very great labour. It was upon the evidence on which this gentleman refused to make a claim that the title was now to be given to him by Act of Parliament. This was a proceeding of so strange a character that if their Lordships were not particularly careful a precedent might be established which would have a dangerous effect with regard to the future. If this precedent were to be followed, a man might be raised to the Peerage by Act of Parliament without any satisfactory proof entitling him to such Peerage. He confessed it was with reluctance that he had come forward in this way; but he felt it his duty not to allow this matter to be treated in so summary a manner without raising an objection and bringing it clearly and distinctly before the House. He entertained the highest opinion of the late Lord Chancellor, who had been the chief promoter of this Bill; but he could not help remembering that the noble and learned Earl acted as counsel for the gentleman who claimed the Earldom. This was unfortunate, although he did not mean to say that it influenced him to the slightest extent. No one had yet stated the grounds on which the Bill was based, and in these circumstances he thought it would be most injudicious for their Lordships to proceed further with the measure. The matter required more inquiry and more time for consideration than the few days given to it. If the present case was to be pursued, and a man was to have a Peerage conferred by Act of Parliament, they would give up everything in the practice of the House in regard to the establishment of Peerage claims.

THE EARL OF SELBORNE said, he had heard the speech of the noble Earl with much surprise. There was a bound to all things, and he thought the noble Earl would have been satisfied with what had already taken place. When the late Lord Privy Seal (the Earl of Rosebery) introduced this Bill at the command of the Crown he stated very clearly the reasons for its introduction. In the course of that debate he had himself an opportunity of stating his reasons for thinking that the introduction of the Bill was right. The measure was received with general assent on both sides of the House, as it promised to put an end to a long and a by no means convenient controversy. The noble Earl stated at that time his objections to the Bill, but neither he nor any other noble Lord moved to reject it on the second reading. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Lothian) took, as he thought, a very generous and right course, saying that he would be very glad if the Preamble could be proved, and that in that case the Bill might pass and the controversy be brought to a close. But the noble Marquess added that he thought it right that the Preamble should be proved. The noble Earl had treated this measure as if it were a Bill to relieve a person who claimed a Peerage from the necessity of making his claim in the usual manner. It was not so. It was really a Bill to remove the impediments which the noble Earl and the two noble Lords who were associated with him in the former case found to exist in the way of the re-establishment of this ancient Peerage. The Committee of Privileges found that the Charter of Restitution of Mary, Queen of Scots, did not restore to John, then Lord Erskine, the ancient title Earl of Mar, but only to restore and reinvest in him the lands belonging to the ancient territorial Earldom. One of the reasons urged against the gentleman to whom this Bill applied was that the action of the Crown had raised an impediment to the dignity being taken out by the person who would have been otherwise entitled to it. It was to remove that impediment, on proof of the Preamble, that the Bill by Her Majesty's command was introduced. From year to year, in Scotland and in England, there had been an increasing number of Peers who felt that justice in some way or another had not been done in this matter, but did not know whether that failure of justice was due to the tribunal of that House or not. They promoted what he would not venture to call an agitation, but a movement in that House and in Scotland which many other persons in Scotland participated in, and it was a fact that twice over 106 Peers, with the Duke of Sutherland at their head, had petitioned Her Majesty to use every means in her power to get the injustice which they conceived had been done redressed. So far was it from being the fact that he—because of any impression he might have formed as the former counsel for this gentleman—had taken any active steps towards having this matter brought forward, he had been one of the very last persons to be moved in it, because he had felt from first to last that it was his duty to maintain the authority of the Committee of Privileges of that House, and he had done so again and again; and he thought that he was maintaining that authority in the best way now, when—instead of leaving their decision to be still canvassed and a sense of rankling discontent by allowing things to go on as they were—he sought to have the difficulty removed in the only way by which, consistently with what had been done by their Lordships' House, it could be done—namely, by removing the impediments which had arisen. He was amazed to hear the noble Earl say that when the Bill was before the Select Committee the matter had been examined in an unsatisfactory way. The Earl of Kellie was present himself, and it was open to him to oppose the Preamble; but he preferred — and with great good taste—simply to assist the Committee by pointing out the objections which he thought were to be taken to the Preamble. No other evidence could have been laid before the Select Committee than than which had been taken previously by the Committee of Privileges, which filled some 800 printed pages. The Select Committee were engaged for four days in investigating the subject, and all their Lordships who had sat upon it had the fullest opportunity of examining into the evidence which had been taken on the previous occasions. In his opinion no case had ever been more clearly proved than this had been. Their Lordships upon that Committee had had the assistance of almost all the noble and learned Lords who ever assisted the House in judicial matters. There was the Lord Chancellor, Lord Blackburn, Lord Watson, Lord Fitzgerald, and himself, and they were all perfectly unanimous with regard to it, while the noble Earl alone dissented from their opinion. He begged to move that the House resolve itself into Committee upon the Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (The Earl of REDESDALE) said, he thought that their Lordships were about to set a new and most dangerous precedent.

Motion *agreed to;* House in Committee accordingly.

Amendments (proposed by the Select Committee) made: The Report thereof to be received *To-morrow;* and Standing Order No. XXXV. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with.

MEDICAL RELIEF DISQUALIFICATION REMOVAL BILL.—(No. 207.)

(*The Earl of Milltown.*)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

LORD BALFOUR, in moving the insertion of a new clause for the purpose of amending the Bill by limiting its operation to two years, said, he ventured to think that a matter of this great importance had not received that calm and deliberate attention which it ought to have done. There had been a great deal of recrimination and a desire, if he might say so without offence to either side, to make Party capital out of the proposal. He should like, therefore, that the final decision of the question should be referred to the new Parliament. He admitted that if this Bill were not passed a certain amount of injustice might be felt for the first year or two. But he thought that in a matter of this kind they ought to be very careful not to go beyond the strict necessities of the case. By adopting his Amendment their Lordships, while giving no ground for complaint on the part of those who from ignorance of the law might have incurred the risk of disqualification through having accepted medical relief, would minimize the evil effect which would flow from the adoption of a principle which might render the working classes less thrifty than they had hitherto been, and might cause the administration of the Poor Law to become more lax than it was at present. He thought it was extremely doubtful whether the mass of the working classes wished this change made; certainly that was his information as to Scotland. The opinion was that the class which would most profit would be the loafers—the men who stood about the street corners, and who, when work was found for them, were not ready to do it. The judgment of the House of Commons had, he believed, never been taken on the point as to the limitation of time of operation of the Bill. All he pleaded for was that time should be given to the working classes to show what their real wishes were in the matter, and if they did so he should be perfectly satisfied. He begged to move the new clause.

Moved, after Clause 4, insert as a new clause—

"This Act shall continue in force till the thirty-first day of December, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-seven, and no longer unless Parliament shall otherwise determine."—(*The Lord Balfour.*)

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, he hoped their Lordships would not agree to this Amendment. His noble Friend had taken it for granted that the principle of the Bill was wrong, and that it therefore ought to be law as short a time as possible. If the working class were opposed to the Bill, nothing would be easier than to repeal the measure; but in what was virtually a Franchise Bill, to insert a clause limiting it to any period was, he thought, absolutely unprecedented. The noble Lord had mentioned a case in which a sewing machine had been given under the name of relief; but relief with which this Bill dealt was medical relief, and no one, he thought, had ever heard of a surgeon prescribing a sewing machine for a patient. His noble Friend seemed to think that the receipt of medical relief was a crime.

LORD BALFOUR said, he was not conscious of having made use of such an expression. He thought the remark of the noble Lord might subject him to some animadversion. His Friends near him had not heard such an expression.

LORD FITZGERALD said, he had distinctly heard the word crime. It struck him as remarkable in such a connection.

THE EARL OF CAMPERDOWN said, he could assure the noble Lord that he did use the word "crime."

LORD BALFOUR said, in that case he would withdraw it, as he had no intention of using it in such a connection.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, he was glad to give his noble Friend the opportunity of correcting the expression. He must oppose the Amendment, and he hoped it would not be entertained.

LORD FITZGERALD also opposed the Amendment, and pointed out that the Government had in taking up the question dropped the clause in Mr. Jesse Collings's Bill which was to remain in operation for only a year and a-half.

THE LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Viscount CRANBROOK) said, that the principal argument in favour of this Amendment was that the Bill would demoralize the poor; but he did not believe it would have that effect, because it would not interfere with the administration of the Poor Law. He hoped his noble Friend would not press his Amendment. It was quite clear what the opinion of their Lordships was upon the subject.

EARL GRANVILLE said, he was very grateful to the noble Earl who had taken charge of the Bill for the argument which he brought forward to day in favour of the measure. The noble Lord who moved the Amendment argued against the whole Bill. He said his proposal was a very modest one, and so it was from him considering that he was opposed to the entire Bill. He did not think that occasional disqualification would deter a man from making application for medical relief. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Salisbury) the other evening used one argument with which he agreed—namely, that on a subject of this kind it was not desirable that this House should differ from the House of Commons. When a proposal such as that which had been by the noble Lord was made in the House of Commons by a county Member it received absolutely no support.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY said, it appeared to him that the effect of the Amendment would be to enact that the Houses of Parliament should consider this question again two or three years hence. He did not think they had so distinguished themselves on the present occasion that that would be a desirable prospect.

Amendment (by leave of the Committee) *withdrawn.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; and to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

SCIENCE AND ART—SITE OF THE NATIONAL PORTRAIT GALLERY.

OBSERVATIONS.

LORD LAMINGTON, in rising to call the attention of Her Majesty's Government to the site of the National Portrait Gallery, said, that only a few months ago this most valuable collection was almost destroyed by fire, and they had a report from Captain Shaw to that effect. His advice would be that the collection at South Kensington should be kept together, and that a building should be erected on the present site. If there should not be a distinct pledge from the Government that a new gallery should be built for this most admirable collection next year, in his opinion the pictures might as well go to Kensal Green as to Bethnal Green, because when they were a few years at Bethnal Green it would be said that they had been safe there, they had done a great deal of good to the people of the East End, and that they might as well be left there. He would ask the noble Lord whether, if the pictures went to Bethnal Green, it would be on the distinct understanding that the present Government, if they were in Office next year—and that was not quite certain—would erect a suitable building for the reception of the pictures? A most valuable picture had been received the other day from the Emperor of Austria—a picture of Pitt addressing the House of Commons on the declaration of war against France in 1793. That picture had been discovered by the industry and assiduity of the Secretary, Mr. Scharf, who went to Vienna. The Emperor of Austria gave it to Lady Paget, and she presented it to the National Portrait Gallery.

LORD HENNIKER said, he thought every one of their Lordships would sympathize with the noble Lord in his desire for the safe-keeping of the very valuable collection at the National Portrait Gallery. The right hon. Gentleman the First Commissioner of Works had given the question very careful consideration in consultation with the best authorities, and he had come to the conclusion that the place where these pictures were at present housed was in a most unsatisfactory state. Another gallery near to it had been spoken of; but it was found that this was equally unsatisfactory. In fact, there was no place available at the present time under the control of the First Commissioner where the collection could be properly housed even temporarily; but he had come to the conclusion that this invaluable collection ought at once to be removed. Under these circumstances, the Trustees decided to make a proposal to the Science and Art Department to take the collection on loan at the Bethnal Green Museum. Among the Trustees were the noble Viscount (Viscount Hardinge), the Chairman, Mr. Gladstone, the Lord President of the Council, Mr. Stanhope, the noble Lord who had brought the Motion forward, Mr. Beresford Hope, Sir Richard Wallace, Sir Frederic Leighton, and Sir J. E. Millais. No doubt, their Lordships would have every confidence in the judgment of such a body. They were unanimous, he was told, in making the proposal, and he believed the noble Lord (Lord Lamington) was the only Trustee who dissented. He had told their Lordships why. It had now been arranged that the noble Viscount the Lord President should be requested to ascertain whether the offer of the loan in question would be accepted. The noble Viscount was the Head of the Science and Art Department, which had control over the Bethnal Green Museum, as well as a Trustee of the National Portrait Gallery; and he wished he was there to speak for himself; but he might say if there was any doubt as to the safety of placing the collection at Bethnal Green that Sir Richard Wallace did not hesitate to leave his magnificent collection there for two or three years. The loan for obvious reasons would be a temporary one only; but he felt sure that, as was the case with the collection of Sir Richard Wallace, which was visited by over 900,000 persons in six months, and that of the Prince of Wales, which was visited by a somewhat larger number in the year, this collection would be most fully appreciated by those living in the East End of London, who might not have such another opportunity of seeing these pictures. To show the general interest taken in the Museum, he might say that the number of visitors, taking the average of 13 years, was 576,000 annually. He thought their Lordships would fully endorse the decision of the Trustees in consultation with his right hon. Friend. He must remind their Lordships that the Office of Works had no control over the collection. The duty of the Office was to provide a proper place when directed by Parliament and the necessary Vote was granted. It was impossible for the First Commissioner to make any definite proposals or give any definite pledge for the future; but it was his intention to give most careful consideration to the question of a site for a new gallery; and if, as he (Lord Henniker) hoped in common with many of their Lordships, an Estimate was prepared to provide a proper place for the collection, which no doubt the new Parliament would have the public spirit to grant, he would endeavour to have plans ready. He might be allowed to express his personal interest in the collection, which could not be replaced, as his noble Relative the late Lord Stanhope had done so much in making the collection. He believed their Lordships would agree with him that his right hon. Friend had done all he could under the circumstances in conjunction with the Trustees to preserve the collection to the country, and to endeavour to come to a satisfactory conclusion as to its permanent home.

House adjourned at a quarter past Eight o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter before One o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 30th July, 1885.

MINUTES.]—Supply—*considered in Committee Resolutions* [July 29] *reported.*

Ways and Means—*considered in Committee—Resolution* [July 29] *reported.*

Resolutions in Committee—*Reported* July 29 —Navy and Army Expenditure, 1883-4.

Private Bill (*by Order*)—*Considered as amended* —Belfast Central Railway (Sale).

Public Bills — *Ordered* — *First Reading* — Consolidated Fund (Appropriation).*

Committee — Criminal Law Amendment [159] —R.P.

Committee—Report — Telegraph Acts Amendment [121]; Expiring Laws Continuance * [247].

Committee — Report — Third Reading—Crown Lands (*re-comm.*) * [51], and *passed.*

Considered as amended — Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) * [251].

Considered as amended — Third Reading — Revising Barristers * [237], and *passed.*

Withdrawn — Licensing Laws Amendment * [226].

QUESTIONS.

—o—

NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—THE SCHOOLMASTER OF STRANAGOMIS NATIONAL SCHOOL, CO. TYRONE.

Mr. MACARTNEY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is the case that the salary due to the late schoolmaster of Stranagomis National School, District 13, county Tyrone, has been withheld from him; what cause has been assigned for withholding it; has the late manager opposed the payment, and given any reason founded upon the rules of the Board for such opposition; is the teacher's salary for the quarter ending September 30th 1883 legally due to him; if so, will it be paid; and, if it be not paid, what remedy has the teacher?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): The salary is withheld in this case because the teacher, after his resignation, locked up the school-room, which is parochial property, and has refused to give up possession of it. He has been repeatedly warned by the Commissioners that his salary cannot be paid until he gives up possession of the room.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EXTRA POLICE AT PORTADOWN.

MR. MACARTNEY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that head constable Egan, of Portadown, upon the 16th instant, telegraphed to Armagh for extra police to be sent to Portadown, without consulting the resident magistrate of Portadown or the district inspector of constabulary?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): It appears that in the temporary absence of the District Inspector, the head constable, who was acting for him, telegraphed for extra police assistance. He did not obtain the advice of the Resident Magistrate, though he endeavoured to do so. An unexpected disturbance had arisen in the town, and the head constable was quite justified in the course he took.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE ACT, 1884—THE PARLIAMENTARY FRANCHISE (SCOTLAND)—CROFTERS UNDER £10 RENTAL.

MR. D. J. JENKINS (for Mr. FRASER-MACKINTOSH) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to a report that certain assessors in Scotland are acting under the belief that Crofters paying under £10 of yearly rent are occupiers of land merely, and not householders within the meaning of the Act, and consequently do not intend to enter such persons on the roll of voters; and, whether an interpretation of the statute, such as that referred to, is not erroneous?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS), in reply, said, this was a matter to be disposed of by the Sheriff in the Registration Court. If anyone was erroneously omitted from the assessor's list of voters, he could claim to be entered or retained upon the roll, and the Sheriff had power to put the mistake of the assessor right. In regard to the latter part of the Question, he was advised by the Lord Advocate that it was simply hypothetical, and he was, therefore, not obliged to answer it.

LAW AND POLICE (SCOTLAND)—ILLEGAL IMPOUNDING OF CHILDREN.

MR. D. J. JENKINS (for Mr. FRASER-MACKINTOSH) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the circumstance of a party of men, including several estate officials, violently driving thirty-three head of cattle, with fifteen children, many of tender age, who were tending them off a grazing near South Shawbost, in the Island of Lewes, on the 21st April 1885, into a pound constructed of stone walls 6 to 8 feet high, belonging to the tenant of Dalbeg; whether the children were so impounded for several hours, and when released by their relatives forcing the gate, found in a state of alarm and great exhaustion; and, whether any investigation was made by the Procurator Fiscal; and, if not, whether he will cause inquiry now to be made?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS), in reply, said, he had received a telegram from the Procurator Fiscal at Stornoway in reference to this Question. It was to the effect that some Shawbost crofters last winter demolished a fence separating their grazing from a tacksman's farm, and, contrary to the tacksman's remonstrances, placed their cattle upon ground which had been in his occupancy for many years. In April last, 33 head of cattle were penfolded, but the children who were herding the cattle were not interfered with. The children followed the cattle of their own accord. At night the owner of the cattle and others forcibly released the cattle from the penfold. The Procurator Fiscal went on to say that the case was reported by him to the Crown Counsel, who directed that no further proceedings should be taken. The tacksman sued the crofters in the Small-Debt Court, and obtained decrees for trespass money and damage to grazing; but no complaint was ever made to the Procurator Fiscal on behalf of the children.

CORPORATE BODIES (METROPOLIS)—THE CITY FELLOWSHIP OF PORTERS.

MR. BRYCE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he is aware of the present unsatisfactory condition of the Fellowship of Porters of the City of London, and in particular of the facts following, viz.:—That, in spite of a new Act of Common Council passed in 1884, the expenses of the management of the body are out of all proportion to its resources; that the capital funds are being reduced owing to the relatively large amount of the annual expenditure; that the state of the accounts has caused the greatest dissatisfaction to members of the body; that, by a recent decision in a court of Law, the bye-laws of the Society have been held to be invalid; and that the Court of Common Council have been more than once petitioned with a view to thorough reform of the Fellowship, but without avail; and, if he will consider whether some means may be taken to remedy these abuses, and a full and impartial inquiry instituted into the state of the body?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS), in reply, said, the matter was now receiving the attention of one of the Corporation committees, to which it had been referred on the petition of the porters themselves. No doubt, owing to the altered times and circumstances, the state of things was not what it might have been expected to be; but the Corporation had no control over the Fellowship, which managed its own affairs. He was informed that the last two allegations in the Question were inaccurate.

RAILWAYS (INDIA)—INDIAN MIDLAND RAILWAY.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether, in the present depressed condition of Indian trade and difficulty in regard to Indian finance, he has given a Government guarantee to a third through line of Railway from the North West Provinces to Bombay, which will compete with two Government lines already in existence, and will connect with and feed a guaranteed line (the Great Indian Peninsular) which has taken the lead in resisting the cheapening of the rates for the carriage of Indian produce to the sea coast?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL): The Question of the hon. Gentleman contains assumptions and inferences to which I cannot reply within the limits of a Question, but which I content myself by generally traversing. The actual fact is this. The line to which the hon. Gentleman alludes is the Indian Midland Railway, of which the Secretary of State in Council has sanctioned the construction, giving the promoters a Government guarantee of 4 per cent. This course has been adopted by the Secretary of State in Council principally in consequence of the urgent and reiterated advice of the Viceroy and Government of India.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—EXTRA POLICE AND HUT AT LISDOONVARNA, CO. CLARE.

MR. KENNY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If the Government now propose to remove the hut and police from Kilmoon, near Lisdoonvarna, county Clare; and, if he is aware that no outrages have occurred in the district for a very considerable time, and that there is no apparent necessity for the retention of this constabulary post?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): It is contemplated to remove this hut in about a month's time, should the state of the locality continue peaceful.

BANK CHARTER ACT, 1845—THE IRISH BANKS—NOTE ISSUE.

MR. GRAY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he is aware that the average value of the notes issued by the Bank of Ireland is more than a million less than that authorised by the Act of 1845; and that the average issued by the Provincial Bank is about one-quarter of a million less than is authorised by the same Act; while the average of the Belfast Banking Company is £100,000, of the Ulster Banking Company over £200,000, the Northern Banking Company about £100,000, and of the National Bank is £300,000 more than is authorised by the Act of 1845, against which these four latter Banks are required by law to keep gold in their vaults; and, whether, under these circumstances, he will take into consideration the propriety of amending the Act of 1845 so as to bring the authorised issue more into proportion with the actual issue used by the public of notes of each Irish Bank, and so as to give to the Banks which have not now authority to issue notes power to do so under proper restrictions and safeguards?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Without endorsing completely the figures of the hon. Member, I am aware that there is a considerable variation in the issues of the privileged banks in Ireland, the two banks named by him issuing less, the others issuing more. than the unsecured circulation permitted to them by Sir Robert Peel's Act; but I am not prepared upon this fact alone to disturb the arrangement made by Sir Robert Peel, which has, on the whole, worked satisfactorily for a period of 40 years. The matter is, of course, one of very great importance and difficulty, and if the present arrangements were disturbed other questions would be raised beyond that which the hon. Gentleman has in his mind.

THE NAVY LIST—WARRANT OFFICERS.

CAPTAIN PRICE asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether there is any objection to retaining the names of retired Warrant Officers on the Navy List, in the same way as those of other Officers?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON): There would be no objection to this proposal being adopted for warrant officers retired in future; but it could not be made retrospective without a great deal of difficulty, and therefore I think it would be advisable to leave the Navy List as it is.

TRAMWAYS AND PUBLIC COMPANIES (IRELAND) ACT, 1883.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will inform the House whether, in the Orders in Council confirming the presentments of Grand Juries for baronial guarantees under "The Tramways and Public Companies (Ireland) Act, 1883," the provisions required by the 10th Clause (sub-section 3) of the Act, with respect to the inspection of the works, have been inserted; if he will state how many Tramways and light Railways are in course of construction under the Act referred to; and, if any inspections have so far been made; and, if so, whether the reports of the inspectors will be submitted to Parliament?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): The Rules of the Privy Council under the Tramways Act make due provision for the inspection of the works by the County Surveyor, a copy of whose Report must be sent to the Board of Works. The Board inform me that they have not yet received any such Reports, and until they do, or until they have before them the accounts which the Act requires them to be furnished with, they have no means of knowing what lines are in course of construction.

INLAND REVENUE—STAMPS—STAMP DISTRIBUTORS IN DUBLIN.

MR. GRAY asked the Postmaster General, Whether the discount of two shillings on each £10 of postage stamps, formerly enjoyed by the stamp distributors in Dublin has been discontinued; whether the discount on bill stamps, which used to be ten pence on each £1 sterling, is now only four shillings on each £10; and, if so, whether he is aware that these facts, in conjunction with the fact that the Inland Revenue Department has undertaken the sale of law stationary at the Four Courts, Dublin, at a mere shade over cost price, constitute grievances amongst the stamp distributors upon which they have petitioned the Postmaster General; and, whether he will consider the desirability of removing or mitigating those grievances?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND): The noble Lord has asked me to answer this Question. The discount on postage stamps has been discontinued for some years throughout the United Kingdom, and that on bill stamps was reduced as stated from the beginning of 1878. These changes were made in pursuance of a general policy of saving for the Revenue the amount of such discounts wherever this can be done without inconvenience to the public. The sale of unstamped forms at the Four Courts was undertaken for the convenience of the public and the Legal Profession, as was explained by my Predecessor on the 5th of March last. I can hold out no hope that these arrangements will be departed from.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL COMMISSIONERS —TAXATION OF LEGAL EXPENSES.

MR. LABOUCHERE asked, Whether the costs, charges, and expenses of the Solicitors and Surveyors employed by the Ecclesiastical and Church Estates Commissioners, and whether charged against the Commissioners or other parties concerned in the Church Estates, are submitted for taxation to the proper officers of the Supreme Court?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS), in reply, said, he had received a Memorandum from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, to the effect that from 1842 to 1867 the bills of costs and charges to be paid by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to solicitors were taxed by one of the Masters in Queen's Bench; but in 1867 he refused to undertake the duty, as it was not covered by the official salary. Up to 1873 they were taxed by an officer of the Court, and since that time by Mr. Bush Cooper.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would not advise the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to pay solicitor and surveyor by salary?

[No reply].

COURT OF BANKRUPTCY (IRELAND)—COPYING CLERKS.

MR. FINDLATER asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, The reason why the copying clerks in the Court of Bankruptcy in Ireland are paid much less for their services in writing and comparing than their brethren in the several Divisions of the High Court of Justice in Ireland, and are otherwise placed in a much worse position by the non-allowance of service-pay which is granted to the copyists in the several Divisions of the High Court upon a graduated scale according to the length of service; and, will he make inquiry into the matter, and, if is satisfactorily proved their grievances do exist, will he take steps to redress them?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND): The copying clerks of the Court of Bankruptcy in Ireland are paid on a scale suggested by the Judge of that Court in 1874, under which they can earn about £100 a-year. The fees paid by the public for the copying do not quite cover the amount thus paid to the copyists. In the Supreme Court the fees, being on a higher scale, are sufficient to meet the cost of the copyists on a higher scale of remuneration. The Treasury have already suggested to the Lord Chancellor that the fees for copying in the Bankruptcy Court should be increased; and they would be prepared to concur in any order in this sense made by him under the Bankruptcy Act of 1872. It would then be possible to consider whether the pay of the copyists ought to be increased.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (IRELAND)—THE COUNTY DOWN ELECTION—THE BALLOT ACT.

MR. LABOUCHERE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to a statement of Mr. Brown, the defeated candidate for county Down, which was published in *The Daily News* of the 14th instant, that—

> "It is a fact that in the polling districts of Newry, Castlewellan, Downpatrick, Killkeel, and Rathfriland, there was a majority for Lord Arthur Hill of no less than 649 votes;"

and, whether the arrangements connected with the taking of votes under the Ballot Act render it impossible for it to be known to whom the votes of any particular polling districts are given?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES): I have been asked by my right hon. Friend the Secretary of State to reply to this Question. The Rules under the Ballot Act provide that before the Returning Officer counts the votes he shall, in the presence of the candidates' agents, count the number of papers in each ballot box, and that while this is being done he shall keep the papers with their faces upwards. I think that in doing this it would be impossible to know the number of votes given in any particular polling district for the respective candidates, but a quick-eyed agent would probably be able to form a pretty accurate opinion as to which candidate had a majority, especially if such majority were large. I may add that I have been informed by my hon. Friend the elected Member that he knows nothing of the figures given by Mr. Brown, and that he believes that his statement does not rest on any adequate foundation.

MR. LABOUCHERE asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department whether he would not issue some sort of Circular to prevent what the right hon. and learned Gentleman had just said was easy—namely, that agents standing near a box could see whether there was a majority for or against a candidate in any district?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS), in reply, said, he would inquire into the matter; but the Question ought to be addressed to his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Oxford.

MR. GRAY asked whether the sharp-eyed agent referred to, who might form a guess as to which candidate had the majority, was outside or inside the booth; if the latter, whether he was not sworn to secrecy, and whether the disclosure of his guess would not be an offence under the Act?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, the agent was authorized to be in the booth. As far as regarded the disclosure, he rather thought that the offence under the Act was the disclosure of the vote given by a particular voter.

THE INDIAN CIVIL SERVICE—AGE OF CANDIDATES.

MR. THOROLD ROGERS asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether the Governor General of India communicated a despatch to the India Office on the age at which candidates for the Civil Service of India are admitted for competition in England; and, if so, whether he will lay the same upon the Table of the House?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL), in reply, said, no despatch had been received from the Governor General of India exclusively confined to the subject; but despatches dated the 1st of October, 1882, and the 12th of September, 1884, had been received at the India Office, in which this subject was incidentally touched upon. He should be very glad to lay these on the Table, together with a selection of the opinions of local officials. He could not pledge himself to lay all the opinions in their entirety upon the Table, as some were confidential. He agreed that the subject was one of much interest and importance.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRIES.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he can now state the terms of the Royal Commission on Trade Depression, and the names of the Commissioners?

MR. SEXTON asked whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer would include Ireland in the scope of the Commission, or grant a separate Commission?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I must ask the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) to give me Notice of that Question. In regard to the Question of the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arthur Arnold), I have to inform him that the terms of the Royal Commission are "to inquire into the extent, nature, and probable causes of the depression now or recently existing in various branches of trade and industry." My noble Friend Lord Iddesleigh, the Chairman of the Commission, proposes to lay a Memorandum before the Commissioners at the first meeting, which will indicate the scope and manner of inquiry at greater length, and that Memorandum will be laid before Parliament. As to the composition of the Commission I cannot yet give a decided answer. It would not be well, I think, to state some of the names only. Some difficulties have arisen in the matter—delay which is not due to us; but I shall communicate the full list of names as soon as I can.

NAVY—H.M.S. "CRUISER."

SIR JOHN HAY asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, How many officers and men have been invalided or sent to hospital from H.M.S. *Cruiser* during the last twelve months, suffering from typhoid or enteric fever; whether there is any reason to believe that the sanitary condition of that ship is unsatisfactory; and, whether he will cause inquiries to be made on the subject from the Naval authorities at Malta?

THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY (Mr. RITCHIE), in reply, said, only one case of fever had occurred. A Report had been called for and received, and it showed that, so far from there being any reason to suppose that the condition of the *Cruiser* was unsatisfactory, the case was quite the reverse.

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—THE BIRMINGHAM ASSIZES—SHERIFFS' EXPENSES.

MR. SAMPSON LLOYD asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he is aware that, by the recent establishment of Assizes at Birmingham in addition to the usual Assizes at Warwick, very heavy additional expenses have fallen on the Sheriff of Warwickshire and his officials. That the two last Assizes at Birmingham lasted together 20 days, and occasioned additional expenses to the sheriff of about £400, which have been disallowed by the Treasury. That the establishment of these new Assizes (while the Bar of the Midland and Oxford Circuits is united at Birmingham) attracts at Birmingham many additional civil causes which would otherwise have been tried in Staffordshire and Worcestershire, thereby shortening the Assizes for those counties, and lessening the claims made on the Treasury by their sheriffs in respect thereof; and, whether Her Majesty's Government cannot grant to the Sheriff of Warwickshire, in respect of the Assizes at Birmingham, similar allowances to those granted in respect to the extra gaol deliveries at Warwick in the spring and autumn?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, no doubt additional expenses were incurred by the Sheriff of Warwickshire by the Assizes which were now held at Birmingham; but the Treasury could not take this into consideration without opening up the whole subject of allowances to Sheriffs in respect of Assizes. Upon the desirability of doing this he, at the present moment, expressed no opinion.

NAVY—THE EVOLUTIONARY SQUADRON—TORPEDO CREWS.

MR. PULESTON asked the Civil Lord of the Admiralty, Whether extra pay will be granted to the men who have been serving on board the torpedo boats engaged in the Evolutionary Squadron?

THE CIVIL LORD (Mr. ASHMEAD-BARTLETT): The duties performed by the officers and men employed on board the torpedo boats during the recent cruise of the Evolutionary Squadron were undoubtedly of an arduous and trying nature, and in the opinion of the Board of Admiralty confer a strong claim to extra pay. It is, therefore, proposed to grant the same extra pay to the officers and men in question as was granted last year on the recommendation of the Duke of Edinburgh for the exercises carried out at Portland.

NAVY—DOCKYARD EXPENDITURE.

MR. PULESTON asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he will lay upon the Table the terms of reference under which the departmental inquiry into Dockyard Expenditure is to be made?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON): There has been a good deal of misapprehension concerning this Committee, which was appointed by my Predecessor, though I have nominated the Chairman. The terms are to inquire into direct or incidental and establishment charges at Her Majesty's Dockyards, especially as to re-classification of items, and securing the economical expenditure under these items; the arrangements under which Dockyard expenditure is apportioned to ships; the nature of expenditure other than that charged direct to ships in the expense accounts; the present distribution of these charges to ships, and what are termed national charges; what system of accounts can be most advantageously adopted to insure these charges being subjected to effective supervision and local financial audit; and whether the payment by the Government of India of 10 per cent on the value of supplies to the Indian troopships is sufficient. The object of the Committee is not to investigate and report generally upon Dockyard management and expenditure, but to re-classify and simplify certain details connected with the expenditure with a view of subjecting them to effective supervision and audit.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF asked whether the terms of the reference would include an inquiry into the wages of the Dockyard *employés?*

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON said, no such inquiry would be made by the Committee; but it was one of the functions of the Admiralty to look into such grievances, and any Memorials properly drawn up would receive their attention.

SIR H. DRUMMOND WOLFF: They do not.

LORD GEORGE HAMILTON: They will.

EGYPT—THE INTERNATIONAL GUARANTEED LOAN.

MR. LABOUCHERE asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he has official knowledge that his predecessor in office intended that the Egyptian Guaranteed Loan should be bought out by the Bank of England and by public tender; why, seeing that the premium at which the Loan now stands shows that this would have caused a saving to the Egyptians of above £200,000, this arrangement has been altered; what is the commission paid to the issuing houses; whether any arrangement has been come to assigning a portion of the issue to Messrs. Rothschild and a portion to Mr. Bleichroeder of Berlin; whether he will see that, in order to preclude any advantage being given to the issuing houses and to their friends and clients in the allotment of the Loan, care will be taken to insure that all applicants for allotments below a fixed figure receive allotments in full should the number of such applicants not exceed the total to be allotted, and that, should such applications not cover the total amount required, other applicants shall each receive an equal amount of the Loan, provided that allotments distributed in this manner cover the total amount required; and, whether he will cause a list of the applicants for allotment, the amount for which each of them applied, and the amount of the Loan which has been allotted to each of them, together with their places of abode, their places of business, if any, and their professions or occupations, to be sent to the Treasury, in order that this list may be submitted to this House, should it decide that it is advisable?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am informed that my Predecessor in Office intended that the Egyptian Guaranteed Loan should be brought out by the Bank of England, and by public tender. I very much doubt whether this arrangement would have caused the saving stated by the hon. Member; but it has been altered mainly in consequence of questions of an International character having arisen with respect to the issue of what I must remind him is a loan depending on an International Guarantee. The commission to be paid to Messrs. N. M. Rothschild, who are the agents for the issue of the loan in London, is £500 per £1,000,000, and reasonable incidental expenses. MM. de Rothschild Frères are agents for the issue of one-third of the loan in Paris, and Herr Bleichröder is agent for the issue of one-third of the loan in Berlin. The allotment will, I presume, be made according to the usual practice observed in such cases. I do not see upon what grounds I could call upon them to pursue the course indicated by the hon. Member, or to furnish a list of the applicants, especially in view of the fact already mentioned, that two-thirds of the loan is offered for subscription in foreign capitals.

MR. LABOUCHERE: I would ask the right hon. Gentleman whether the £500 per £1,000,000 to be paid to Messrs. Rothschild includes the brokers' commission; whether there is any arrangement by which Messrs. Rothschild have a right to take £3,000,000 of the loan at the price of issue, 95½; whether there is any further arrangement by which that firm have a right to be paid the £1,000,000 sterling which they have advanced at this 95½—thereby giving them a profit, taking the present premium, of £20,000 upon the original £1,000,000 advanced, and £40,000 if they choose to exercise their option as to the other £2,000,000?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I must ask the hon. Member to put these Questions on the Paper?

MR. LABOUCHERE: Perhaps it will be more convenient if I call attention to the matter, and ask further Questions on the Appropriation Bill.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I think it would be well that the House should be in full possession of the facts. There has, of course, been a Correspondence on the subject between Her Majesty's Government and Messrs. Rothschild, and that Correspondence will be laid on the Table and printed as soon as possible.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Will that Correspondence be in the hands of hon. Members in time for them to call attention to the matter on the Appropriation Bill?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I will do my best to have it ready in time.

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—MR. EDLIN, Q.C.

MR. GRAY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether Mr. Edlin, Q.C., has yet returned from his Continental tour; and, if not, when he may be expected; at what date he was granted leave of absence; for what period he was granted leave of absence; by whom he was granted leave of absence; and, on what ground he was granted leave of absence?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): Mr. Edlin had been given leave of absence by the late Secretary of State for the Home Department, who was the only person competent to grant it. The leave was given on the date of the completion of the business of the Sessions which were held on June 4. Mr. Edlin has not had any leave since the autumn of 1883.

MR. GRAY: The right hon. Gentleman did not answer the first part of the Question.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE: He has returned.

TRAMWAYS ORDER IN COUNCIL (IRELAND) BILL.

COLONEL COLTHURST asked the honourable Member for county Cavan, Whether he will withdraw his notice of opposition to the Tramways Order in Council (Ireland) Bill, so as to allow that measure to be discussed?

MR. BIGGAR, in reply, said, he had never known a case in which there was so much anxiety to have a Bill defeated as in regard to this particular Bill; and he did not feel disposed to withdraw his Notice of opposition, and thus assist Sir George Colthurst, who was a nephew of the hon. and gallant Member for Cork County, to rob the ratepayers.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—GALWAY AND ARRAN ISLAND DISPENSARIES.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he will authorise the Local Government Board to sever the connection between the Galway and Arran Island dispensaries in accordance with the unanimous and frequently-expressed opinion of the Galway Board of Guardians in favour of this change; whether the result of the amalgamation is, that Galway is compelled to pay £70 a-year towards the expenses of the Arran Dispensary, amounting to almost 14 shillings in the pound of the entire expenditure of the Arran Dispensary; and, if, when the amalgamation was originally agreed to by the Galway Board of Guardians, at the suggestion of the Local Government Board, any intimation was conveyed that it would result in such a heavy addition to the already heavily burdened taxpayers of the Galway Union?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): I do not see any reason to alter the decision arrived at in this matter. It appears that the amalgamation of the two districts involves upon Galway an additional rate of about 1½*d.* in the pound, which, however, is more apparent than real, as the Government recoup half of the medical officer's salary, and half the cost of medicines; while the creation of a separate district for Arran would, by reason of the small valuation of the island, impose on it a burden that it could not reasonably be expected to bear. I am informed that the probable financial results of the change were not discussed with the Galway Guardians when the amalgamation was effected.

BOARD OF INTERMEDIATE EDUCATION (IRELAND)—EXAMINATION OF GIRLS.

MR. JAMES STUART asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he is aware that a circular has been issued, dated 6th July, by the Intermediate Education Board for Ireland, containing a list of proposed changes in the intermediate examinations for girls, and stating that the proposed changes will be taken into consideration early in November next; whether he is aware that, with a view to drawing up the rules and programme for 1887, it is necessary that a determination should be come to on this matter before the end of the present year; whether he is aware that the proposed changes involve the sanction of a different standard for girls and boys instead of the common standard at present existing; whether he is aware that similar proposals have been repeatedly made or circulated of late years by the Intermediate Education Commissioners, and whether such alteration, if carried into effect, would prevent women in many cases from being properly prepared so as to avail themselves of the facilities afforded them by the Royal University of Ireland by Act of Parliament; and, whether, in consideration of the facts of the case, he will advise the Lord Lieutenant to withhold his sanction from such a change in the standard?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): The Board of Intermediate Education have issued a Circular inviting an expression of opinion from persons engaged in the education of girls as to certain proposed changes in their programme of examinations. These changes, if adopted, would, it appears, come up for the sanction of the Lord Lieutenant next year, and would come into operation the year after. Their effect would appear to be that, while girls would still be able to compete in the same programme with boys, they would have the option of being examined in a course restricted to girls alone. It would obviously be premature for me to give such advice as that suggested in the last paragraph of the Question.

FACTORY ACTS (EXTENSION TO SHOPS) BILL.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK asked the honourable Member for Stockport, Whether he will remove the block which he has placed against the Factory Acts (Extension to Shops) Bill, and allow the House to consider in Committee a Bill to which thousands of young persons are looking with intense interest?

MR. HOPWOOD, in reply, said, though the question was put to him in a sensational manner, calculated to put pressure upon him, he could not waive any means in his power to secure full publicity and discussion before the passing of such a measure.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK: In consequence of the answer of the hon. and learned Member, may I ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether he will give me any facility for bringing on this Bill? There are only one or two Amendments of a purely verbal character; and though it relates to young persons who have no vote, that very fact will, I am sure, be admitted in itself to constitute a claim on the kind consideration of the House.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Whatever may be the merits of the Bill, I can express no opinion upon it; but if I gave the hon. Member the promise he asks for I should be subjected to similar requests from many other hon. Members. I am afraid, therefore, I cannot make any promise.

PUBLIC HEALTH—THE CHOLERA IN SPAIN.

MR. LABOUCHERE asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether, in view of the ravages of the cholera in Spain, and of the fact that there are large imports of fruit from Spain, during the latter end of August and in September, which are packed in sawdust, it is intended to take any steps to ensure that cholera germs will not, by these means, be introduced into this Country?

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR): English ports that are in frequent communication with Spain have received much recent attention from the Board's Medical Department. Hitherto we have no experience of cholera ever having been conveyed in the manner suggested; but, if indications of its possible transport by such means should be observed, the Board will not fail to convey to local sanitary authorities such cautions as may be requisite.

SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND BILL.

MR. BUCHANAN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government, under the Secretary for Scotland Bill, to transfer the permanent staff of the Education Office, who at present transact the business of Scottish Education, to the office of the new Minister?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): I think it is rather premature to give any opinion on this subject until we have heard the discussion on the Bill on the question of education.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES BILL.

MR. GRAY asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he will be prepared to extend the Housing of the Working Classes Bill to Ireland?

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR), in reply, said, the Bill was not a Government Bill, and it was not in his charge, but in the charge of the Home Secretary.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMEMT (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, the hon. Member would remember that the Commission which inquired into this matter, and on which he (Mr. Gray) took so important a part, did not inquire into the rural districts of Ireland. He did not know whether the Question of the hon. Member applied to towns.

RAILWAYS (INDIA) —THE CANDAHAR AND QUETTA RAILWAY.

SIR HENRY TYLER asked the Secretary of State for India, Whether the Railway is being pushed forward in the direction of Candahar, and for what length and to within what distance of Cadahar it has already been authorised; and, what, if any, further length is contemplated?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL): The continuation of the railway from Quetta has been sanctioned to extend 30 miles in a northwesterly direction to a place called Shebo. I have no knowledge of any further intention to continue the railway beyond that point at present; but I may tell the hon. Member that a very large accumulation of railway material is being concentrated at Quetta, so that if commercial and political interests should appear at any time to be favourable the line might be continued without any great delay in the direction of Candahar.

MR. BUCHANAN: Will the noble Lord give any assurance that the House will be consulted before any sanction is given to extending the Quetta Railway beyond Shebo—that is, beyond the railway sanctioned in the Government of India's despatch of September the 22nd, 1884?

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL: I am afraid I cannot make that promise. There is not the slightest probability of the railway being completed to Shebo at the earliest before 1886, and as to what may happen in 1887 I cannot tell the hon. Member.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS—SWINE—THE ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

MR. R. H. PAGET asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether, with reference to his reply of 13th instant, and in view of the fact that the Lords of the Council are now advised that Local Authorities have not the power, under existing Orders of Council, to compel the cleansing and disinfecting of premises used by dealers in swine, he will move their Lordships to issue an Order of Council to enable Local Authorities to deal effectively with such premises, and thus prevent the spread of disease?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY (Mr. CHAPLIN): My hon. Friend appears to be under some misapprehension in saying that the Lords of the Council are advised that Local Authorities have not the power to compel the disinfection of premises used by dealers in swine under the existing Orders in Council. That is a statement which applies solely to premises which are not connected in any way with markets, or sale-yards, or places of that kind. Where they are so connected the Local Authorities have ample powers under the existing Orders already. I should be very glad to go further, and to meet the views of the hon. Member if I could. But it appears to me that it would be exceedingly difficult to define who is and who is not a dealer in swine, and I do not see at present how his object can be attained without requiring private owners, however healthy their animals, to disinfect their premises all over the country; and that is a course which it appears to me would not be expedient.

EGYPT — THE INTERNATIONAL GUARANTEED LOAN.

MR. VILLIERS-STUART asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the present market value of French Three per Cents. is about 80 per cent.; whether that of Russian Four per Cents. is about 80; whether that of Italian Five per Cents. is about 99; whether that of English Three per Cents. is about par; whether the New Egyptian Three per Cent. Loan is to be brought out at 95½ per cent.; whether this issue price is determined, not by the National credit standard of any Foreign State, but by that of England; whether it is England that is ultimately responsible for the payment of the dividends and capital; and, whether the additional interest acquired in Egypt by England in consequence of her guarantee will be weakened by the nominal share taken in it by Foreign Powers, or his hand rendered less free in dealing with Egyptian reforms?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The prices quoted by the hon. Member are no doubt correct. I cannot undertake to say how far the issue price of the new Egyptian Loan is determined by the credit standard of England. Various other circumstances must be considered as elements in the determination of such price. The responsibility of England is the same as that of the other guaranteeing Powers, except Russia—namely, a joint and several guarantee for the regular payment of the annuity of £315,000 required for the purpose of the loan. The question of the effect of a joint guarantee on the interests of England in Egypt involves matter of opinion rather than of fact. If the hon. Gentleman wishes to know my opinions on the subject he will find them expressed in the debate of last spring; but this country being pledged to the Convention, of course it was our duty to carry it out.

Mr. VILLIERS-STUART: I hope the right hon. Gentleman will be able to give a re-assuring answer as to the effect of the joint guarantee upon the freedom of the hands of England in carrying out reforms.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD: I wish to know whether the right hon. Gentleman will lay on the Table the Correspondence with foreign Governments on this subject?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I cannot answer that Question without Notice.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

Captain PRICE: I wish to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, considering the great interest taken in the Criminal Law Amendment Bill, he will make that Bill the first Order after the Report of Supply?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I am afraid that I find myself in a difficult position in this matter. Twice, at least, I have given a distinct promise to the House, and especially to the right hon. Gentleman the late Postmaster General, that the Telegraph Acts Amendment Bill should follow the Report of Supply. I do not think that I can fairly depart from that promise.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: I quite recognize the desire to proceed at once with the Criminal Law Amendment Bill; but the difficulty I have felt in postponing the Telegraph Bill until next week is that there may be but few Members left in the House to discuss it. I would suggest, however, that the Government should put the Telegraph Bill down as the second Order for to-morrow, and that if the Criminal Law Amendment Bill is not concluded by 12 o'clock Progress should be reported.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No, Sir; I cannot agree to that suggestion. It might be that the House would be in the middle of a discussion on important points in the Bill, and we should have to report Progress in order to proceed with the other measure. There is a universal feeling that, at any rate, the Telegraph Bill should not be used to delay the progress of the other Bill; and if the House is willing to consent to it I should suggest that we should proceed with the Committee on the Telegraph Bill to-night, on the understanding that whatever happens it should not be continued, say, beyond 9 o'clock.

INDIA (FINANCE, &c.)—THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

Sir ROBERT FOWLER (Lord Mayor): I should like to ask the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India, When he proposes to bring in the Indian Budget? If the noble Lord cannot answer me I will put the Question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Lord Randolph Churchill): I should be greatly obliged to the right hon. Baronet if he will obtain that information for me from the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I am afraid I cannot answer the appeal.

THE COASTGUARD (IRELAND)—THE DIVISIONAL OFFICER AT DUNDALK.

Mr. O'BRIEN (for Mr. Harrington): I beg to ask the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether it is true that the Divisional Officer of Coastguards in Dundalk, when visiting the stations in his district, compels the Coastguards to groom and attend his horse; and, whether, on the occasion of these official visits, he is in the habit of raising religious controversies with the Catholic coastguards under his command?

The FIRST LORD (Lord George Hamilton), in reply, said, he had received a communication from the Divisional Officer of Coastguards in Dundalk altogether denying the allegation contained in the Question of the hon. Member.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL: Can the right hon. Gentleman give the House any further information with regard to the course of Business, especially with regard to the taking of Saturday Sittings?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I have made some inquiries as to the taking of Saturday Sittings; but I find that the objections are so considerable that I cannot promise to take them. I cannot make any further statement as to the progress of Business until we see our way more clearly.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS—EYE ELECTION.

Mr. LABOUCHERE asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether he is aware that the returning officer in the recent bye election at Eye has charged £131 10*s.* 4*d.* for the official costs of taking 808 votes, or an average of nearly 3*s.* 4*d.* per vote; whether he is aware that this charge averages per vote a larger amount than has been charged at any previous election since the passing of the Act limiting the expense of returning officers; and whether the charge is legal?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster), in reply, said, he believed the amount charged by the Returning Officer was accurately stated in the Question; but he would remind the hon. Member that all these charges were fixed by the Schedule in the Returning Officers Bill, 1875. The question whether the charges were legal depended on whether the items were in accordance with the Schedule, and he had no means of arriving at what those items were.

In reply to Sir Henry James,

The ATTORNEY GENERAL said, he had only looked at the Schedule summarily; but he would obtain the information, add up the items, and see if they were in accordance with the Schedule.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

——o——

SUPPLY.—REPORT.

Resolutions [29th July] *reported.*

Resolution 1.

Mr. SEXTON said, that before this Estimate was adopted by the House he wished to declare emphatically that in his opinion, and in the opinion of those who from their election were concerned in the affairs of Ireland, the Department of National Education did not merit the confidence reposed in it, and did not use the power in its hands, either intelligently in furtherance of public education, or fairly in the interests of the teachers themselves. They had good and sufficient reasons for entertaining this opinion, some of which were stated yesterday. There were others which could not be outlined within the compass of an ordinary debate. The Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant had yesterday excused himself from expressing an opinion on the subject, as he had not had time to examine into the question. He would, however, ask the Head of the Government what they were going to do during the Recess? He would ask them, would they specially investigate the constitution, rights, and methods of the Department in Ireland? He would inform them that one of the first claims of the Irish Party was a demand for the abolition of this Department, and the establishment in its place of some Board more reasonable in its constitution and more satisfactory in its effects. In order that the Government should be in the position next year to deal with the subject from information obtained during the coming winter, he believed that a thorough investigation should be made into the working of the present Board of Education; and he would undertake to transmit to the Government a Memorandum setting forth the grounds upon which he and his Friends held that that Department, as now constituted, ought not to be invested with the great trust involved in the primary education of the country.

Colonel NOLAN said, he wished to draw attention to one point upon which he claimed that they were entitled to the consideration of the Government—namely, the grievance of Irish National School teachers. The Chief Secretary for Ireland had hold them very fairly that he was not very well acquainted with the subject; but it was one with which the Chancellor of the Exchequer was acquainted. In Committee the previous day there had been nobody on the Front Opposition Bench to speak on the subject on behalf of the late Government, as all its Members were conspicuous by their absence. He believed that it was admitted by all sections of the House that the Irish schoolmasters were wretchedly paid, as were also the schoolmistresses; and he believed that he was justified in asking the Government to provide some remedy for them in the next Parliament.

MR. LEWIS said, that the opinions as to the inadequacy of the pay of the teachers were not confined by any means to the Benches opposite. In Committee in this House, and otherwise, Members sitting on his side of the House, over and over again, had stated their belief that the condition of these poor teachers was pitiable in the extreme. The subject was one which, as a matter of common justice, demanded the earnest attention of the Government.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, that before the right hon. Gentleman replied he wished to say a very few words. The hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), in his remarks with regard to the Education Department, voiced the opinions of every single Member from Ireland. It would be rather too much for them to have to state all the causes of complaint which they had against that Department. It was a Department which had distinguished itself by two leading characteristics—secrecy and despotism. There was one point upon which he believed they would have to ask either the Chief Secretary or the Chancellor of the Exchequer to give them an immediate assurance. The inspectorships of schools in Ireland had been one of the highest and most valuable prizes which were open to the teachers under the competitive system. He had received recently a letter informing him that the Board of Education proposed to abolish the competitive system for these valuable appointments, and to substitute a system of nomination, thereby doing a great and flagrant injustice to the great mass of the Irish teachers. He believed that such a step should, before being carried into effect, be submitted to the judgment of the House. He would warn the Government that were such a retrograde and revolutionary change made it would, on very many occasions, form the subject of discussion in the House.

MR. DAWSON said, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, when Chief Secretary for Ireland, had known something of the subject of education in Ireland, and he regretted that he had not held the Office for a greater length of time, as he believed that if he had he would have modified a great blot which was presented in the case of the National system of education in Ireland. These schools cost the country £36,000 a-year, and out of this only £3,000 was devoted to the benefit of the students. He also complained that some of the schools in Ireland which were intended for poor children were entirely occupied by the children of the upper classes, who sometimes drove to and from the schools in carriages. He believed that the funds devoted to the National Schools should be used for the purpose of converting them into Technical Schools, for the purpose of teaching the children how to be able to engage in various industries.

MR. CORRY said, the Model Schools had done a great deal of good in Ireland, and he believed that it would be a very great pity if they should be abolished.

MR. BERESFORD said, he had received deputations on many different occasions from the teachers complaining of the smallness of their pay. He hoped that the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be able to see his way to making some improvement in their position.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA said, there was a consensus of opinion in favour of a new Irish law with respect to the Model Schools and of the subject of education in Ireland.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, I think there is no disposition on the part of the House to resume at any great length the debate of yesterday. I can only express my regret that as the Government are not now in a position to deal with the question of Irish education, I am not able to make any very definite reply to hon. Members; but I can thoroughly endorse the speech of my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary yesterday. Though, as a matter of fact, we are perfectly aware of the inadequacy of the pay of the National teachers, I would remind the House that there are other points to be considered beyond increasing the pay of the teachers. There is the question where the money is to come from, and the further question whether, if we increase their pay, we ought not also to take some security that they shall be better able to perform their duties. These matters, as hon. Members must admit, require very careful consideration by the Government and the House of Commons. A Bill was introduced this year by the late Government which dealt to some extent with these matters; and I can only repeat that the whole question, and not only the teachers' remuneration, will receive the most serious consideration of the Government, and we shall endeavour to make some proposal in regard to it in the next Session of Parliament. If the Memorandum mentioned by the hon. Member for Sligo, with regard to the manner in which the National Board of Education performed its duty, should be received by my right hon. Friend, that Memorandum will also receive our most careful attention.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR asked for an answer to his question with regard to the subject of Inspectorships.

[No reply.]

Resolution *agreed to.*

Resolution 2.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary for the Colonies (Colonel Stanley) had given the House some information on this subject yesterday; but he hoped the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would give them much more before the House rose. The action of the Boers in the defence of their country, which led to the fight at Majuba Hill, would go down to posterity as a great action; but he hoped that action would not prejudicially influence Her Majesty's Government. The right hon. and gallant Gentleman had praised both Sir Charles Warren and Sir Hercules Robinson; but he (Sir George Campbell) held it was totally impossible for the Government to approve of the course pursued by both, for nothing could be more diametrically opposed than the opinions of Sir Charles Warren and Sir Hercules Robinson. For his own part, he thought that Sir Hercules Robinson could be relied upon as a "canny" administrator, whereas Sir Charles Warren had been guilty of great indiscretion. Passing, however, from that matter, it was his opinion that after the Government of this country had taken on themselves so much responsibility in regard to the affairs of Zululand, and wrought so much evil there, they ought now to do some good, and for that purpose should take Zululand under our own protection. There was also a good deal to be said in favour of establishing a great South African Dominion, if the taxpayers of this country were willing to find the men and money required for the purpose. Such a scheme, if put forward by any Government, would deserve every attention. He could see no signs of any settled policy in South Africa having been adopted either by the late or the present Government. They had simply drifted along, though no doubt the present Government were right in interfering as little as possible until they had laid down the lines of a firm and settled policy. If the Government were prepared to act in accordance with the recommendations of Sir Charles Warren a great deal of good might be effected, but much expenditure would be incurred. The Government must seriously consider whether they were prepared to establish a great Dominion in Central Africa. Whatever their determination might be he trusted that they would adhere to a settled policy, and would discontinue the practice of temporizing.

Mr. WODEHOUSE said, that at that late period of the Session every minute of time was precious, and he would not detain the House for many moments; but seeing that the discussion of yesterday in Committee upon this Vote was confined within very narrow limits of time, and that the subject was a very important one, he hoped he might now be allowed to make a few observations, especially with reference to what was the main question for the moment—namely, whether the administration of the Bechuanaland Protectorate should be transferred to the Cape Colony, or be retained by the Imperial Government. Hon. Members had expressed alarm and dissatisfaction at this extension of Imperial responsibilities; and he did not pretend to think that a Protectorate in the heart of South Africa, far away from the coast, was a light matter. He admitted it to be a very serious undertaking; but the thing was done now, and it was too late to draw back. To recede now, to abandon Natives whose claims to our protection had been formally recognized, to suffer extensive territories to relapse into the anarchy and bloodshed from which Sir Charles Warren was sent to extricate them, to waste all the fruits of his Expedition, to repeat, in short, on a smaller scale, the tragic *fiascos* of the Soudan, would not only cover us with the merited scorn and derision of the world, but would also add another instance—perhaps the most flagrant on record—to that long series of vacillations and contradictions of Imperial policy which all knew and confessed to have been the direct curse of South Africa. He would remind hon. Members who objected to this Protectorate that it had been founded, so to speak, under the auspices of a Prime Minister than whom no statesman had ever been more keenly sensible of the burden of Empire, and of a Secretary of State for the Colonies, who, of all the men that ever presided over that Office, was probably the most averse to accept fresh responsibilities, and the least impulsive or adventurous. Surely, then, there must have been reasons of extreme cogency for its establishment. He might, however, be told that it was the wish of Her Majesty's late Government that the Cape Colony should undertake the management of the Protectorate without delay; and that, undoubtedly, was their wish on the 28th of May last, as was evident from Lord Derby's despatch of that date. But if that were the wish and aim of the late Government throughout their Bechuanaland proceedings, they certainly made a most singular selection of officers when they sent out, first Mr. Mackenzie, and then Sir Charles Warren; singular, because both those gentlemen were known to hold definite and decided opinions about the proper methods of administering Native territories. Seven or eight years ago they were in Bechuanaland together; they had exchanged ideas, and worked out schemes of administration, and the vital essence of their schemes was Imperial, rather than Colonial, control. Moreover, both those gentlemen had submitted their schemes to the Colonial Office before they left England; and seeing that Lord Derby had approved the policy distinctly sketched in Sir Charles Warren's Memorandum of the 29th of October last—a policy whose foundation stone was Imperial control—it would be no surprise to him (Mr. Wodehouse) to learn that Sir Charles Warren had been a good deal disappointed by Lord Derby's subsequent action. If Lord Derby dissented from the policy indicated in the Memorandum, why did he not say so at the time, rather than let Sir Charles Warren go out to South Africa with misconceptions in his mind? And he (Mr. Wodehouse) could not but think that the unhappy differences which had arisen between Sir Charles Warren and Sir Hercules Robinson were, in large measure, due to the ambiguous attitude of the late Secretary of State upon the fundamental question of Imperial or Colonial control. He hoped that the present Secretary of State would take warning, and make up his mind on this point with as little delay as possible, because until it was settled nothing would go right. For his own part, he had not the slightest faith in the capacity of the Cape Colony—even if it had the will, which he greatly doubted—to govern the Protectorate properly. The Colony had failed miserably in the far easier task of governing Basutoland. While under the Imperial Government the Basutos had not cost us a penny of money, nor an hour of anxiety and trouble. They were the best tribe in South Africa, the most peaceable and the most susceptible of civilization; but a few short years of Colonial management had half ruined and wholly demoralized them by drink and fighting; and in that condition they were handed back to the Imperial Government. When, therefore, thousands of Bechuanas and other Natives had actually been invited by Imperial officers to invoke the Queen's protection, he would strongly deprecate a transfer and delegation of responsibility which might prepare for them the fate of the Basutos, or something worse. Besides, he very much doubted whether these Natives would have anything to do with the Protectorate when they were told that they would pass under the control of the Colonial Government. Did anyone suppose that Montsioa and the other Chiefs in his neighbourhood had already forgotten the civilities exchanged at Rooi Grond, in November last, between the Cape Ministers, Mr. Upington and Mr. Sprigg, and the freebooters, including, perhaps, the murderers of Mr. Bethell? He (Mr. Wodehouse) believed that the Chiefs would reject the Protectorate if it were transferred to the Colony; and then, with a bankrupt Transvaal, chaos would reign again in those regions. If the management of the Protectorate were undertaken by the Colony, the very magnitude of the task, and the very weakness of the Colony to execute it, would drive Colonial Ministers into such a Native policy as would shock enlightened opinion at home, and then it would be impossible to resist a demand for the renewed intervention of the Imperial Government. What, for example, was the cardinal point, the *sine quâ non* condition of the settlement of Bechuanaland which the Cape Ministers had proposed to Her Majesty's Government? It was the recognition by Her Majesty's Government of the validity of those Treaties which the freebooters forced on Mankoroane and Montsioa in July and October, 1882. In other words, the Cape Ministers insisted that Her Majesty's Government should formally recognize and sanction the system of filibustering in South Africa. He did not at all undervalue Colonial co-operation; but he believed that all that was best and most enlightened in Colonial opinion, whether it were English or Dutch, would deprecate the transfer of the Protectorate to the Colony, and would be glad to see it administered by the Imperial Government in a spirit of liberality towards White settlers, but with every safeguard for the territorial and other rights of the Native Tribes. It would be a mistake to suppose that all the Dutch farmers were in active sympathy with the freebooters, or actively hostile to the Imperial Government. A certain proportion, no doubt, of the Boers were men of extreme opinion and violent feeling, and these men were wont to come to the front in times of agitation and disturbance; but the majority of the Boers were quiet people, who cared above all things for peace on the Frontier—peace to cultivate their farms and sell their produce. And under a Government that gave them tranquillity to make money they would be loyal and contended. He must now refer to a very important consideration, which probably had more than anything else to do with the establishment of the new Protectorate; he alluded to the German appropriation of Angra Pequena and the adjoining coast. He would not dwell upon the humiliating incidents of the story of Angra Pequena; but whatever wounds had been inflicted on National pride, and whatever detriment had been done to National interests in those transactions by procrastination and reluctance to face responsibility, we had at least secured command of the trade routes which met near the capital of the Chief Khame, and we had placed ourselves between the German and the Transvaal Boer. So far, so good; but if the Protectorate were handed over to the Cape Colony, the Frontier relations between Great Britain and Germany in South Africa would virtually be left in charge of a Colonial Ministry, and he (Mr. Wodehouse) would regard that as a most hazardous experiment. A quarrel might arise any day on a question of Customs Duties, or the importation of arms and ammunition, or on the treatment of a roving German trader; and when the quarrel had arisen it would not be open to Her Majesty's Government to shelter themselves behind the Colonial Government. In one of those speeches which Prince Bismarck made last year, and which attracted so much attention, he drew a distinction between the Imperial Government of Great Britain and her Colonial Governments, and it was of the action of the latter that he especially complained; but he added, and rightly added, that it was to the Imperial Government alone that he could look for explanations and redress. He (Mr. Wodehouse) would, therefore, absolutely decline to provide the Colonial Government with opportunities for quarrelling with Prince Bismarck. And now he had one entreaty to address to Her Majesty's Government—namely, to entreat them to take care that the Residents or other officers stationed in the Protectorate should have at their disposal sufficient mounted police or other armed force to insure obedience, and make their authority respected within the limits, and especially on the borders of their jurisdiction. He urged this point, because he knew not how many pages of our South African experiences teemed with warnings of the risks and mischiefs of leaving our officers in helpless positions, when they were inadequately equipped with executive resources. He should have liked, had there been more time, to speak of Zululand; but he would not abuse the patience of the House. He would content himself with saying that the spirit of the observations which he had ventured to make with regard to Bechuanaland was equally applicable to Zululand; and that he, for one, should rejoice if, by a fuller recognition of Imperial responsibilities in that quarter also, Her Majesty's Government were able to bring about a more satisfactory state of affairs among a people to whom we had meted very hard measure, and whose present condition was a blot on the name and fame of England.

SIR ROBERT FOWLER (LORD MAYOR) said, that the hon. Member who had just sat down had expressed most forcibly the arguments in favour of making Bechuanaland a Crown Colony. It had been said that too much prejudice had been shown against the Boers; but he had said before, and he still felt, that if any war waged by this country was a just and righteous war it was that carried on against the Boers. If this country gave up the Cape Colony it would be a great blow to the position of the Colonial Empire; and, therefore, it seemed to him that we must not be too much afraid of being involved in a certain amount of expense, and he thought that money spent there would be very well spent. Of course, if, as had been done in the case of the Cape, one policy were initiated to-day and another to-morrow it must lead the way to great expense, and therefore one policy ought to be settled on and adhered to. At the same time, he thought his right hon. and gallant Friend, having so lately come into Office, had acted very wisely in reserving these questions for his own consideration; but he did hope that the decision he would arrive at would be the course recommended by the hon. Member for Bath (Mr. Wodehouse) both with regard to Zululand and Bechuanaland. They not only had to look on this question as an Imperial question, but also as a question of humanity; and he hoped the country would not consent to abandon these unfortunate Natives to the tender mercies of their enemies.

MR. COURTNEY said, he would warn the Government not to hurry into an annexation of territory from which the more prominent force of national opinion might compel them to withdraw. The hon. Member for Bath (Mr. Wodehouse) always spoke on these subjects with knowledge and experience; but, at the same time, he must dissent from the policy the hon. Member had put forward. The late Government did not adopt this Protectorate over Bechuanaland in the absolute sense that had been inferred. It was quite true they adopted the Protectorate, but it was not done with a view to the assumption of the control of Bechuanaland by the Government of this country, but by the Government of the Cape Colony. That was the policy recorded in the last despatch of Lord Derby, and the question before the present Government was whether they intended to maintain that attitude, or whether they would resolve to maintain the Protectorate in their own hands. He believed that the force of circumstances would sooner or later compel this country to abandon the policy of extending its responsibility with regard to the government of these territories. It was impossible to draw a line beyond which the force of circumstances would not compel them to go. Wherever the line was drawn, there were outside it the same elements of disorder, and a further advance would be necessary, and the prospect of a continuous advance was one of the greatest arguments against an advance at all. A good deal had been said about Sir Charles Warren, and free reference had been made to his differences with Sir Hercules Robinson. Whatever might be said of his success, he declined altogether to recognize his immense virtue in restoring peace in Bechuanaland. Any man could govern in a state of siege. Sir Charles Warren had a large armed force at his command, and he proclaimed something very like martial law. Under those circumstances it was not surprising that he did restore peace; but in restoring it he had irritated the opinion of Cape Colony. In his (Mr. Courtney's) opinion, if the present Government were not prepared to assume the Protectorate of Bechuanaland they would find it necessary to send out someone with a more statesmanlike appreciation of the situation than Sir Charles Warren. The whole of our recent difficulties had been aggravated, if not entirely caused, by the intervention of the Home Government. This had done all the mischief. It had been said that the Cape Government were responsible for the Basuto troubles; but these were really due to the action of Sir Bartle Frere, who forced the Cape Government to carry out a policy which was popular at home, though unpopular at the Cape. The same might be said of our difficulties in Zululand. There never would have been a war, the scheme of government which had been successfully maintained would not have been broken up, and the attempt to set up 13 princelings would never have been made, but for the pressure from home and the advice dictated from home. We were betrayed into errors by want of knowledge of the actual facts, which could only be obtained on the spot. The object which the Lord Mayor had so much at heart—namely, the welfare of the Natives—would be far better secured if intrusted to the heads of the local Government. No doubt there was a higher morality at home in regard to the Natives than there at present existed at the Cape; but we at home were without adequate information and knowledge, and were, as a consequence, constantly led into errors which inflicted on the Natives far greater evils than if matters were left to the control of the local authority. For instance, our action towards Montsioa, however well-intentioned, had produced adversity for him and the Natives on the borders of the Transvaal far greater than if we had never interfered at all. If the present Government were to adopt the policy of their Predecessors and establish a Protectorate over Bechuanaland, they would, in the present state of public opinion, possibly meet with approval. That, however, would not last long, the Cape Government would soon re-assert its claims, and the confusion that would attend on our rule would compel us to withdraw from Bechuanaland. As the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian had said, we had been lying uneasily on one side, and then turning uneasily on to the other. For many years a policy of increasing our responsibility had prevailed. It was reversed in 1876, but was again revived. In 1880 the issue before the country was that of withdrawal from responsibility, and that withdrawal from responsibility was approved by public opinion. He was not sure that that issue would be determined in the same way now if placed before the country; but he believed that in the long run the balance of public opinion would be definitely against the increase of responsibility. In a recent despatch the Secretary of State stated that public opinion approved of the course pursued by Sir Charles Warren. Those who sat on the Treasury Bench and the Front Opposition Bench should consider what public opinion was. Public opinion was a great force to which it was necessary to bow, although it seemed to hurry us now in one direction and then in another; perhaps on many subjects it might be necessary to let it flow over us; but there were questions as to which it ought to be the ambition of the right hon. Gentlemen sitting on the Front Ministerial and Front Opposition Benches to create a public opinion—for public opinion on these subjects depended upon what they said and what they did—and to maintain it in its proper course, instead of giving way to that which so constantly caused our humiliation. In the present case, public opinion seemed to be evidenced by the fact that some hysterical newspaper screamed out that Sir Charles Warren was the saviour of the world. He hoped that an attempt would be made to guide public opinion rightly on the subject of South Africa, and to follow the course which that correct public opinion pointed out.

Sir ARTHUR HAYTER said, he did not desire to enter into the general subject raised by this Vote; but he wished to express his gratification at the statement made by the Colonial Secretary that the Estimate made by the late Government of £675,000 for the Bechuanaland Expedition was not likely to be exceeded. He was sure the right hon. and gallant Gentleman would bear him out in saying that there was no country in regard to which it was more difficult to make an accurate Estimate of the probable expense of an Expedition. He had been told that in regard to the Zulu War, when the present Secretary for the Colonies was Secretary for War, it was found almost impossible to gauge beforehand the expenditure, owing to the distances and the wildness of the country. He was very gratified to hear that the recent Expedition had been successful, and that its cost would be covered by the Estimate that had been made by the late Government in November last. With regard to the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman that the military force should be replaced by armed police, he could certainly assure the right hon. Gentleman that he would find abundant facilities in this country for recruiting such a force. At the time it was proposed to send out the Expedition those who were charged with the duty of raising it were literally besieged by men who were anxious to join, and there were also numbers of officers who were desirous to be of service to their country in the matter. He considered that the policy which had been indicated of reducing the force at present under Sir Charles Warren and substituting for it a kind of Frontier Police Force was a right policy to pursue.

MR. RATHBONE, in contradiction of what had been said by the Lord Mayor, said, that he had had occasion to meet an officer who was in charge of the Natives during the Transvaal and Zulu War. He had been told by that officer in the strongest terms that our interference between the Boers and the Natives had been productive of much misery to the latter, and that, if we had but left them alone, they would have taken better care of themselves than we took of them, and would have settled many of their quarrels among themselves.

MR. M'ARTHUR said, he believed that if we had left the Zulus to themselves they would have gone to war with the Boers, and would have shown themselves the stronger party of the two. This country went to war with them, and conquered them; and now they were in a defenceless state, and in a much worse position than when we found them. The Boers violated every Treaty into which they entered, and no confidence could be placed in any Treaty which they made. The most terrible cruelties had been committed by the Boers on the Natives, and some of the atrocities which had been perpetrated were so great that it was almost impossible that they could have been committed by such a partially civilized race. He believed, however, that both parties had made a mistake with regard to the Transvaal. When the Transvaal was annexed, he believed that the state of things existing was very bad indeed. The Transvaal Government was known to be almost insolvent, and at the present time it was well known that the Government had become bankrupt. The greatest dissatisfaction existed at that time, and the people of the Transvaal were in favour of their country being annexed by England. Opinions differed in regard to the propriety of annexing the Transvaal. At the time when the subject was under discussion, he consulted a man who knew more of the condition of South Africa than, perhaps, any man then living—he referred to the late Dr. Moffat. The rev. gentleman told him of the terrible atrocities which he had seen in that country, and he stated that it was impossible for him to describe the pleasure he felt when he heard that the Government were about to annex the Transvaal. Another mistake which had been made had consisted in the patching up of a peace. He believed that this country did it from the best of motives, and in the anxiety to avoid the shedding of blood. What had been the result? To this day the people of the Transvaal believed that they had defeated the British Army, and that they could do so again. A good deal had been said with regard to the extension of our territory in this region. Although he was averse from the extension of territory if the desire was simply to extend our Dominions, he believed it was a commendable proceeding if such extension of territory was taken in defence of our own interests, and in defence of our position in the country. He was glad that the trade route had been secured; the loss of it would have been a great calamity not only to the interests of South Africa, but to our own. He did not believe that the annexation of those territories, although at the outset costing a good deal of money, would become a permanent source of expense to the ratepayers of this country—on the contrary, he believed it would conduce to the greater development of the trade of this country. We had incurred responsibilities in South Africa, and we had given pledges to the people which, he believed, we were in duty and in honour bound to fulfil. He trusted that the Government would not allow themselves to be influenced by motives and arguments brought forward with the intention of lessening their responsibilities in this respect. He hoped we would be prudent and circumspect, and he believed that justice and humanity and every right feeling induced us not to violate the pledges we had given, but that they induced us to do our best to carry them out.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel STANLEY) said, the hon. Member for Carnarvonshire (Mr. Rathbone) had spoken of the Natives and the Boers, and he recommended a policy that they should have been allowed to fight out the question between themselves. Without wholly agreeing with the remarks of the hon. Member, he should be incurring some blame if he did not at this stage make some comments on the subject before them. He must, however, ask the House to allow him to limit himself to that which the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) had rightly called a negative statement. At this period of the negotiations, at the time when the Expedition in South Africa had, to a certain extent, terminated its primary duties, when there were other important matters on which negotiations were going on, and when important information reached them from day to day, he hoped that it was making no undue demand on the patience of the House to ask that they might be allowed time to consider the general aspect of affairs in South Africa, and to endeavour to arrive at that calm and dispassionate view of the situation, which would enable them, if possible, to mark out some line of procedure which would afford some guarantee that their future proceedings there, by whomsoever conducted, should not be characterized by that vacillation which had been found fault with by so many hon. Members. He did not desire now to go into the past, nor, for obvious reasons, would he enter on the field to which he had been invited, and discuss how far the various acts of the late Government, as connected with South Africa, were entirely consistent with themselves, or even with the statements of some of their principal Members. As to that he thought it better to "let the dead past bury its dead." He now desired to look forward and to view the situation as it lay in front of them, and to endeavour, further, to take such a course as might, on the one hand, allow them to afford all due protection to those who were subject to their dominion, and, on the other hand, as might leave to be determined, under convenient circumstances, those other details of administration and government upon which, at the present moment, he felt himself unable to pronounce an opinion. In regard to not going back upon the past, he would make one exception in consequence of a remark that fell from the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney). The hon. Member spoke of Zululand, and he charged a good deal of that which happened to the Home Government. So far from its having been the case that the Home Government was answerable for what took place in the Zulu War, he wished distinctly to enter his protest against any such statement, and to say that, as far as he was aware, not only was that not the case, but that diametrically the opposite was the fact; for the Home Government being opposed to any advance into Zululand, that advance was made before they knew it was intended.

MR. COURTNEY explained that he did not attribute it to the direct action of the Home Government, but to the emissaries they sent out. ["No, no!"]

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (Colonel STANLEY) said, he accepted the correction of the hon. Gentleman; but he had not understood him in that sense, nor did it appear that the House had. The hon. Member had told them further about the vacillation that had existed, of the desire for the extension of territory shown at one time, and the desire for retrenchment and economy evinced at another; and, although the country in 1880 pronounced against the extension of their responsibilities, yet the very Government which strongly denounced that policy of the extension of their responsibilities incurred at a later period larger responsibilities than any that they had undertaken before. Now, he ventured to claim, not on behalf of the Government, but on behalf of the country, time for the Government to consider carefully those great problems. They had undertaken the maintenance of order and of safety among the subjects of the Queen. They did not share the view of the hon. Member for Liskeard, who thought that Montsioa would perhaps have been able to conduct his own affairs, and that if no interference had taken place on his part and on that of the other Chiefs by the Government, he would have been in a better position. Well, he supposed that the hon. Member must have forgotten a good deal that appeared in the Blue Books. For himself he thought it was more than open to doubt whether, if that course had been taken, Montsioa would even have been in existence at present. That was a policy the advocacy of which was left almost exclusively to the hon. Member for Liskeard, who, however, had the courage of his opinions, and was always ready to express them. In conclusion, he did not know that he had any further remarks to make on the subject, except to say that if hon. Gentlemen speaking in many cases with further knowledge than he could pretend to possess so disagreed on all questions as they had done in that debate, surely there was much to be said in favour of the course which the Government intended to pursue—namely, to examine carefully into those great questions, to obtain the best information they could, and to act on it, he hoped, without fear on the one hand and without prejudice on the other; and acting in that spirit they hoped to fulfil the duties which they owed to the country in respect both to the Colonial Government and to those with whom the Colonial Government was concerned.

Resolution *agreed to.*

Resolution 3.

MR. SEXTON said, he desired to call the attention of the Postmaster General again to the condition of the mail service between Dublin and the West of Ireland. That service was conducted at only about one-half the speed which was attained over the general mail service in every part of England and Scotland—in fact, it was the worst in the Kingdom, and the reason was that the Midland Great Western Railway Company, which carried the mails, only received half the remuneration given to the other Railway Companies in Ireland for carrying the mails. The reason given for refusing to place this Company in the same position as the other Companies was that the returns for the service were not sufficient to warrant the increase; but the Province of Connaught was the object of special legislation for the relief of distress there, and he thought it was plain from that that, in this important matter of the transmission of the mails, its very poverty ought to be an additional reason why the public Revenue should be applied to give it a helping hand. Somebody must lose, and he did not think it was fair to ask the Railway Company to lose. The Railway Company were willing to give an improved service at the lowest rate that would not involve loss to the shareholders; and he did not see why, under those circumstances, such a Department as the Post Office, which made an immense profit, should not give an efficient service without expecting the Railway Company to lose by it. Would it be believed that the whole question in dispute in this important matter was a small sum of £3,000 a-year, and because of the refusal of the Post Office authorities to spend that sum, the people of the West of Ireland were left with a mail service which was a scandal to modern times. Only the other Session the Government agreed to a mail contract for the West Indies which would involve a loss of £49,000 a-year, and he did not see why such a sum should be spent on a distant Dependency whilst the claims of 1,000,000 of people in a Province of what was called the Sister Country were disregarded. He appealed to the noble Lord to do the Province of Connaught justice in this matter. If the present Government hesitated to give a pledge on this subject, Irish Members, who next year would be much stronger in the House, would make it their business to retaliate upon the Department, to prove that this gross disregard of the interests of a whole Province would no longer be tolerated.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he wished to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the danger to which the public in the Metropolis was exposed by the Parcel Post vans and the mail carts being unprovided with lamps at night. Several accidents had already occurred.

MR. WARTON said, he wished to enter his protest against the continued use of the plural number in the title of the "Parcels Post," pointing out that in the case of the book post such an inaccuracy, as he regarded it, was not committed. He also thought that some alteration of the scale for the Parcel Post was desirable, the unit of 1 lb. being very inconvenient. As it was, 1 lb. or more of any article would just weigh over the scale by reason of the package in which it was wrapped. He would further suggest the desirability of a system of insurance for small parcels.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD desired to call attention to a grievance increased of late by the introduction of official Post

Parcel carts. In these carts the drivers were often seated under a hood or cover, so that they could only see straight forward; and he suggested that provision should be made for so seating the drivers that they could see freely to the right and left, and avoid the danger of coming unawares with other vehicles, or driving over pedestrians at the crossings of the streets.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord JOHN MANNERS) said, he had really nothing to say against the statement made by the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton). He believed it was a statement of facts; but whether he could say that he agreed with the conclusion drawn from these facts was a matter which he thought, perhaps, had better stand over for the present. When he came into Office, he found that his Predecessor had gone closely and impartially into the question, feeling honestly anxious to do what he could for the Province of Connaught in the matter; and he himself since did not see his way to go beyond the offer which his Predecessor had made. The hon. Member for Sligo now, however, pointed out that Connaught was a neglected Province; that the Legislature, recognizing this view, had given relief and assistance to the Province; and that the present Government, recognizing these facts, might apply to Connaught a more generous and liberal rule than usually enforced by the Post Office. He was sure the hon. Gentleman would not expect him suddenly to give any answer upon that question as now raised; but he would say this to the hon. Gentleman, that he would promise carefully to reconsider the whole question, and see whether terms and arrangements might not be come to between the Railway Company and the Post Office. Beyond that he did not think it would be right for him to go now; but he would promise the hon. Gentleman that at least he would do that. With regard to the question of giving lights to the mail carts, he would, now that his attention had been drawn to the matter, see whether an alteration could be made in the desired direction; and with reference to the suggestion that the limit of weight in the Parcels Post system should be raised, the matter was under consideration, and he hoped that ere long the grievance complained of would be remedied.

COLONEL NOLAN said, he thought the answer of the Postmaster General was satisfactory as far as it went. He did not speak there on behalf of the Railway Company. He spoke in the interests of his constituents, who did not care about the railway, and on whom the present mail service pressed very hardly. He wished to inform the noble Lord that before the Session closed the hon. Member for Sligo would put a a Question on this matter, and he trusted by that time he would have made up his mind upon it.

Resolution *agreed to.*

Resolution 4.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. PLUNKET): Sir, as the Committee last night were good enough to allow me to take this Vote without discussion, I then promised I would explain it at this stage. I will endeavour to do so as briefly as possible. This is a Vote for £500, part of a sum of £4,000, to defray the expense of erecting a statue at Trafalgar Square, Charing Cross, to the memory of the late General Gordon. The House will remember that about a fortnight ago a Question was asked in this House by the Lord Mayor of London as to whether it was the intention of Her Majesty's Government to propose a Vote for this purpose? My right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer replied that the Government believed that it would be in accordance with a very general feeling, both in this House and in the country, that such a memorial should be raised to General Gordon, and that, when there had been time to consider the question of the position and the precise character of the memorial, he should be prepared to propose the necessary Vote to the House, and my right hon. Friend immediately directed me, as Chief Commissioner of Works, to inquire into the subject. I have lost no time in doing so, and I have been favoured with many valuable and interesting suggestions from various quarters, for which I desire to take this opportunity of expressing my thanks; but I feel I am especially indebted to the kindness of three of our most distinguished living artists—Sir Frederick Leighton, Sir John Millais, and Mr. Watts—whom I particularly consulted. I hope to be able to take advantage on almost every point of the most valuable advice which they were good enough to give me; but there is one respect in which I am sorry that I am not able to give effect to their opinion, but to which I desire for one moment to refer. These three distinguished artists were unanimously of opinion that this memorial should take the form of an allegorical group of sculpture rather than of a simple statue, and, no doubt, there is much to be said in favour of that suggestion; but, on the whole, after careful consideration and consultation with many persons whose opinions on such subjects are entitled to great weight, I have come to the conclusion that it is a statue reproducing as nearly as may be the man—General Gordon—that the people of this country at the present time, and for all time to come, will most desire to have among them. Perhaps, however, I may be allowed in one sentence to express my own entire concurrence in the opinion of the three eminent artists to whom I have referred, that this great and wealthy Metropolis is lamentably deficient in works of Art sculpture, except so far as regards statues, and I am afraid some of them are not very good. There is enough of young and rising talent, as they assure me, in the Art of sculpture in this City well able to adorn our public places with worthy works of genius of the kind that they suggested should be produced on the present occasion. I must, however, speaking for Her Majesty's Office of Works, say that, in view of the many demands that we are obliged to make upon the Treasury for public buildings and other expenses, we really could not have the face to apply to the Treasury to give us anything for these groups of sculpture for the purpose of generally beautifying this City; and I may add that I have not a doubt, if we did make such an appeal, what the nature of the answer would be. But I fully recognize how great would be the improvement which a few really well-executed groups of statuary would be to London; and, if I may venture to say so, I think London is rich enough to indulge itself with such a luxury. At any rate, I throw out the suggestion for consideration merely on my own responsibility as a Member of this House; and I have only to add that if the public wishes for it, and will spontaneously find the money for such a purpose, I should be delighted to undertake to find admirable sites; and if they wish it, and will trust me with the choice, I will find, besides, artists to whom I believe can be safely confided such a high and noble task. And now, as to the statue of Gordon, for which I am asking this Vote, it is not necessary, nor would time permit me, to speak at any length. Certainly, I shall not say one word that can awaken even an echo of the stormy controversies which have lately raged over the romantic adventures and melancholy death of the late General Gordon; for I hope, and I feel sure, that the Vote I am now asking for will be given with absolute unanimity. Whatever any of us may think of his views upon political and other public questions, there can be no doubt that the character and career of General Gordon had seized on the imagination not only of his own countrymen, but also of foreign nations, as practically illustrating many of the greatest and noblest qualities of Englishmen—of the kind of Englishmen who have made England what she is. His fame is the common property of all English-speaking people, and must for ever remain their proud inheritance. It is impossible for us at this time to say what kind of reward General Gordon himself would wish to have desired. Modest as he was brave, gentle as he was gallant, probably he cared as little as any man for the ordinary honours and the usual rewards which even brave and distinguished soldiers are proud to wear upon their breasts. Although we know that during the siege of Khartoum he endeavoured to encourage his followers through the dangerous vigils and the terrible monotony of that long trial by distributing among them such decorations as it was possible for them in their straitened circumstances to produce, still I do not think that he himself was a man who set much store by that kind of distinction. But no one can now doubt that all through the immortal siege his own mind ever and again went back to his own country beyond the desert and beyond the seas, and that his thoughts were constantly at home while "the last sad hours of valour's task moved slowly by." All that is over now—

> "The soldier's hope, the patriot's zeal,
> For ever gone, for ever crost.
> Oh! who shall say what heroes feel
> When all but life and honour's lost?"

Gordon has lost his life, but his honour shall remain bright for ever in the minds of his countrymen. His fame shall be set among many proud and melancholy memories, adorned by the noblest of all decorations—the simple dignity of self-devotion. But we think it is right—and I am sure all will agree with us—that here in the centre of the Metropolis of this great Empire, close to the Memorials of Nelson, of Napier, and of Havelock, should be placed the statue of another great Englishman, who in the fulness of his fame, in the prime of his manhood, gave up his life freely at the call of duty, and in what he believed to be the service of his country.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, that the House of Commons, in encouraging English sculptors, had a right to expect the fullest benefit from the money expended. While agreeing with the idea of a statue to General Gordon, he must say he had never heard of such a sum as £4,000 being taken without one word being said to the House as to the form the memorial should take. The work of erecting this statue was no ordinary matter; and he therefore thought that some right hon. Gentleman upon the opposite Bench ought to give the House some information as to the intentions of the Government as to the site in the first instance, the material, and the mode in which they hoped to obtain the best work of Art under the circumstances. If it were simply to be left to the Board of Works as a matter of taste, he should protest against the Vote. In any case, he trusted the work would be given to a native artist.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON said, he did not rise for the purpose of depreciating General Gordon's character, for they all knew he was one of the bravest of men, and that also he had absolutely no fear of death. What he wanted to ask the House was, what great services to the State or to the world had General Gordon done that should make the House of Commons vote money for a statue of him, for he (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) supposed that statues were not voted to men simply because they were good and honourable? It was true that General Gordon had heroic qualities; but he (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) himself did not think that General Gordon did any good to the State while at Khartoum. ["Oh!"] In the first place, when he was sent out to the Soudan his orders were to set the Natives free; he was ordered to come away from Khartoum, but he disobeyed orders and remained, and instead of setting them free he spent his time in fighting against and trying to coerce the Soudanese, a people described by the late Prime Minister as rightly struggling to be free. Then, again, General Gordon had at one time destroyed the irrigation works on the river, an act of war which would not have been permitted by a Mahommedan Power. He did not think Gordon's actions were creditable to this country; and we had got not honour, but disgrace, from this Khartoum business. General Gordon, in his opinion, cost this country millions of money, and he believed if Gordon were alive now he would be the first person to object to money being spent for this purpose.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he entirely agreed with what the hon. Baronet (Sir Wilfrid Lawson) had said. He (Mr. Labouchere) thought when they were asked to vote money for a statue to General Gordon, they ought to have some more distinct statement from the Government as to why they should pass the Vote. It must be remembered that General Gordon came before them as one who went to Khartoum for the specific purpose of making peace. No doubt he fought very gallantly; but he fought in a cause which, in the opinion of some hon. Members, was a wrong one. In that manner he did not carry out the instructions or intentions of those who sent him out. ["Oh!"] Hon. Members said "Oh, oh!" but if they looked at Gordon's diaries they would find that he railed against his Government, and the instructions they gave him. As he understood, they were asked to vote this money on account of what Gordon did at Khartoum. Well, he objected to what Gordon did at Khartoum, and, therefore, he was opposed to the granting of this money.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, that if the two hon. Gentlemen who had just spoken (Sir Wilfrid Lawson and Mr. Labouchere) divided the House on the question, they might possibly find a brace of Tellers; but they would find no one else to follow them into the Lobby. He (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) wanted to know why they were asked to vote £500? His right hon. Friend had not stated what he was going to do with that particular sum. General Gordon was essentially a British hero. He went to Khartoum and Egypt, and sacrificed his life to British interests; and, therefore, he hoped his right hon. Friend would select a British sculptor to carry out the work of his statue. No doubt General Gordon was also a great hero; but they ought to know how this £4,000 was to be expended. In that country, as well as in any other, he contended that where public works had to be carried out, British artists should be employed in preference to foreigners; for there was no doubt whatever that they would prove themselves worthy of the patronage bestowed upon them. He hoped his observations would receive the consideration of his right hon. Friend the First Commissioner of Works. He objected to trusting this matter to the Board of Works, which, in many ways, had shown its incapacity for dealing with questions of Art. Let them look, for instance, at Hyde Park Corner, where the Board had removed the Triumphal Arch, and set it in a hole where it now stood, on an inclined plane, a disgrace to the Department and to the Metropolis.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY said, he could not fail to enter his protest against the manner in which Ministers came to the House, asking for a specific sum for some public work, and, without affording the House any particulars of the object for which the Vote was required, expecting the House to grant it without demur.

The FIRST COMMISSIONER of WORKS (Mr. Plunket) said, that the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Mitchell Henry) would perceive, on looking at the Estimates which were laid upon the Table yesterday, that the particulars of the Vote for providing a statue to General Gordon at Charing Cross were duly given. This Vote of £500 was merely asked for as a preliminary step, so as to obtain the sanction of the House to the proposed statue, and so as to enable him to enter into negotiations with regard to it, so far as related to the selection of an able sculptor to carry it out. It was not usual to state the names before the negotiations were actually commenced, and, indeed, he could not now state who the artist would be; but he could say that the statue would be of bronze, and would be placed at Charing Cross.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY asked whether it would be an equestrian statue?

Mr. PLUNKET said, it would not.

Resolution *agreed to.*

TELEGRAPH ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Hibbert.*)

[BILL 121.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre.*)

Mr. Alderman W. LAWRENCE said, it was of great importance to the trading community of the country that the Bill should be passed without delay. He was anxious that the sole benefit of 6*d.* telegrams should not fall altogether to the rich and powerful, but that small tradesmen and others should derive equal advantages therefrom. He must, however, be allowed to express his strong disapproval of any plan which would abolish free addresses. That would be a departure from the principle on which the telegraph system was established when it was taken up by the State. When the telegraph service was in the hands of different Companies there were different rates of charges for telegrams to different places—some telegrams costing only 6*d.*, while others, such as telegrams to Ireland, were sent only at a minimum charge of 2*s.* The State resolved to buy up the telegraphs, and to have a uniform charge for telegrams to all parts of the Kingdom, allowing 20 words to be sent for 1*s.*, and in all cases allowing addresses, whether long or short, to go free. It was now proposed to alter that system by counting in the words of the addresses as part of the telegram. That would be tantamount to inflicting a fine on long addresses; and, having regard to the fact that in London it was frequently very necessary to add the name of another street to define where the first-named street was, a charge for addresses would be especially hard on poor people in London. Thus, there were 37 High Streets in the Metropolis, and these had to be further described by the name of the district in which they were situated. He must be allowed to express his surprise that the Post Office authorities should say that the average address of telegrams numbered 10 words. He had compared the number of words in the addresses of letters which he had received from all parts of the Kingdom with the number of words in his own address; and he found that the smallest number of words in his own address was seven, doing away with any prefixes or affixes, and simply confining the address to the name and the direction. That he believed to be the average of the addresses of most hon. Members in the House; but, no doubt, there were a large number of addresses which reached eight, nine, and 10 words. He was convinced that many telegrams contained at least 14 words in the address, and the probability was that the average number was higher than 10. With regard to the step which was proposed to be taken in regard to the curtailment of addresses, he believed it to be a downward movement, and that it would be breaking up that principle of the uniform rate irrespective of distance or the number of words in an address, and breaking down the system which had been established at the taking over of the telegraphs. He had proposed that there should be 6*d.*, 9*d.*, and 1*s.* charge for telegrams; but the Department was opposed to any system suggested by an outsider. He could not understand whether the Post Office wished to increase the service of telegrams among the mass of the people, or whether they simply wished to extend its use among those classes who at present used it. He believed that if they abolished free addresses much disappointment would be caused, believing, as he did, that the proposition of a free address was a good one. It had to be borne in mind that when it was said the Department would lose by continuing the system of free addresses the loss thus estimated was simply a speculative one. There could be no doubt that the telegraphic system was capable of extension in a manner which the Post Office authorities had not the slightest conception of; and therefore, in the interests of the Post Office and for the benefit of the great mass of the people, he would support the proposition that the addresses should be free. Personally, he was in favour of a tariff of four words, including free address, for 6*d.*; and he would be prepared to move an Amendment to that effect in Committee.

Mr. J. G. HUBBARD said, he was concerned to hear from his hon. Colleague in the representation of the City of London (Mr. Alderman Lawrence) views which were exceedingly heretical with regard to political economy. His hon. Friend had stipulated for a fixed price—for what? Why, for a variable quantity, a course of procedure directly contrary to political economy. The right hon. Gentleman the late Postmaster General had made a proposition which he considered to be fair and reasonable, and clear and distinct in its operation. In this case, when they had a fixed price for a fixed quantity, no one could have any doubt as to the construction of his message. With regard to the desire which had been expressed to meet the wishes of the humbler classes, he must point out that telegrams were a luxury of the rich, and that the poorer classes only used them in circumstance of extreme emergency, when questions of economy could not be permitted to enter into their calculations. For instance, in the case of serious illness or urgent business the humbler classes might have recourse to the telegraph, but scarcely otherwise. They must look upon this as a question of the State conferring a great boon on the public; and, in that view, it ought not to be compelled to do its work at less than a fair equivalent. Therefore, inasmuch as the rates of postage for letters and parcels varied according to the weight of the missives, so it was equitable and right that the cost of telegrams should vary according to the length of the messages that were wired. The right hon. Gentleman the late Postmaster General had done all that could be done in the way of concession. The proposition of ½*d.* per word was perfectly definite and clear, and he hoped it would be carried into execution.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he hoped that as no Amendment had been made to the Motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," the House would now allow the Bill to get into Committee.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Construction and citation of Acts) *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Postmaster General to make regulations for conduct of business and to fix charges).

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord JOHN MANNERS), in rising to move the following Amendment:—In page 1, line 24, to leave out Sub-section (1), and insert—

"(1.) The charges for the transmission of written telegrams throughout the United Kingdom shall uniformly, and without regard to distance, be at a rate not exceeding sixpence for the first three words of each telegram, or for each telegram of less than three words, and not exceeding one halfpenny for each additional word.

"(2.) The names and addresses of the senders and receivers of written telegrams shall not be counted as part of the words for which payment shall be required,"

said: It will be necessary for me to occupy the attention of the Committee for a short time while I explain the objects I have in view in bringing forward this Amendment. I regret that the necessity which was imposed upon us by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), in moving the second reading of this Bill on the very afternoon on which the House adjourned for the Easter holidays, rendered it impossible for me to raise the question involved in my Amendment at that stage of the measure. I would much rather have introduced it as a question affecting the principle of the Bill than have had to propose it, as I am now compelled to do, in Committee. But the matter is one in which I have now no alternative; and, therefore, I have to ask the Committee to decide the point at issue between the right hon. Gentleman and myself at this stage. I shall endeavour to restrict what I have to say to the point immediately at issue, and that is the abolition or continuance of free addresses. In what has just fallen from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London (Mr. Hubbard) I entirely agree. I object as strongly as he can do to the proposal to abolish free addresses, and I am about to ask the Committee to come to a decision upon that point. Both the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Reading and myself are under the same financial restriction in dealing with this question. The right hon. Gentleman told the House that he might have proposed a scheme of a more liberal character but for the necessity imposed on him by the Treasury of not exceeding the estimated loss of £180,000 a-year, which is the anticipated effect of his proposal, and I may state that the Treasury have also imposed, and, I think, very wisely, the same restriction on myself; and I have therefore had so to arrange my scheme for obtaining for the public the great boon and privilege of free addresses, as not to exceed the estimated loss of £180,000. The experienced officers of the Department have assured me that the scheme I have now to propose will meet that Treasury requirement. Therefore, as regards the financial result, my scheme and that of the right hon. Gentleman opposite will stand on a footing of perfect equality, and the only thing the Committee will have to decide is the question of the respective merits of the two schemes. And here I may say that I wish the Committee to decide this question, not with reference to the effect of one scheme or the other on any one particular class, or upon certain classes of the community, but with respect to the interests of the general body of the telegraphing public. I agree with the worthy Alderman opposite (Mr. Alderman Lawrence) that we ought to extend our view a little further, and that we should not have regard merely to those individuals or classes who are at present in the habit of using the telegraphs, but that, as we are about to make a great change for the first time in 16 years in the general system of telegraphy, we ought to endeavour to arrange the charges so as to induce those classes who have not hitherto been in a position to avail themselves of the advantages of the telegraphic system to come in in the future. Now, I say that the scheme proposed by the right hon. Gentleman opposite will not fulfil these conditions. I admit that, with respect to certain important classes of the community, they might see their way to obtaining an advantage under that scheme. I admit, for instance, that the rich or well-to-do merchants, traders, stockbrokers, and so on, who have fixed, and, what is still more important, registered addresses, might be gainers by the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman. And, further, I admit that a class of whom I wish, as Postmaster General, to speak with every respect and consideration — the betting fraternity — might also gain advantage under that scheme. But my contention is that the State did not give £11,000,000 for the purpose of taking over the telegraphs from private companies, in order that the influential class of merchants and traders, and still less the betting fraternity, should be favoured at the expense of all the other classes of the community. That is the position I take in regard to this matter, and I hope the Committee will not be induced to give its sanction to any scheme which cannot be shown to be advantageous to all classes of Her Majesty's subjects. Now, in the first place, I have to point out that the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman opposite depends entirely on what I cannot but regard as an assumption—namely, that those who use the telegraph can conveniently and safely cut down the number of words in their addresses from an average of 11 to an average of five. That, I assert, is a pure assumption, and I am not disposed to think that because the extremely clever and ingenious officers of my Department have assumed that this great reduction can be safely effected in the number of words used in addresses, that, therefore, this saving could be safely or conveniently effected by the great body of the telegraphing public. If, when a person goes into a telegraphic office to send a message, he always had one of those experienced and highly skilful officers of the Telegraph Department at his elbow to say how many words he might safely excise from the addresses he wished to give, then I should admit the contention of the right hon. Gentleman; but as that is not the case, and as the great body of the telegraphing public will have to decide for themselves how many words it is necessary or expedient they should use in the addresses they give, they must, in the last resort, be the best and only judges of what is and what is not a safe and satisfactory address for the telegram required to be delivered, and whether it is one that will insure that the telegram shall be delivered, not only with certainty, but with speed. On this point I notice that the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), in one of the speeches he made recommending his scheme to the House, mentioned the fact that in his Office he had failed to discover any record of a decided opinion on the part of his distinguished and lamented Predecessor on the subject. I confess that I am not very greatly surprised that the late Mr. Fawcett did not leave at the Post Office any record of what he thought on this subject. But if he left no such recorded opinion at the Post Office, he did express an opinion, and I think a very decided opinion, on the point in this House. I will, if the Committee will allow me, read the words used by Mr. Fawcett on that subject. Speaking on the 28th March, 1883, he said—

> "There is no doubt much force in what the noble Lord (Lord John Manners) has stated, and that the abolition of free addresses would bear most heavily upon the poor."

And here I must, in justice, interpose the remark that the theory of maintaining freedom of addresses has always been one that I have held upon the ground here stated, and that I entertained it quite as strongly when I was not Postmaster General as I do now, and so expressed myself when the hon. Member for the City of Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) moved his Amendment to the proposal of the late Government. Well, Mr. Fawcett went on to say—

> "A well-known man's address is generally a short one, and in many cases would be simply the name of the town in which he lives; whereas a poor person's address would often have to name the court and the street in which he lived. It would be found that the poor person's address was often several words longer than rich persons'; and, therefore, to charge for the address at one halfpenny per word would undoubtedly press somewhat heavily upon the poor."—(3 *Hansard*, [277] 1011.)

So far as I know—and I had several conversations with that lamented Gentleman after the debate just referred to—Mr. Fawcett never changed his opinion that the abolition of free addresses, or, at any rate, of the receiver's address, would be a great detriment to the poorer class who might be anxious to use the telegraph. I believe that Mr. Fawcett, as far as is known, retained that opinion to the last. But I would suggest that there are several classes who even already have expressed in public their opinions upon the matter. I have mentioned those classes who, in my belief, would gain by the abolition of free addresses; I should now like to put before the Committee a record of the views held by those persons who may be taken to represent a large class of the community, and who entertain a different opinion. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Reading is probably familiar with the recorded opinion of a very important constituent of his own — I allude to Mr. Sutton, the great seedsman. He is a gentleman who has, I believe, something like 70,000 customers belonging to a very important and influential class of the trading community, and he has expressed his opinion on the matter in the following terms. Writing to *The Times* upon the subject, Mr. Sutton said—

> "A very considerable portion of our business transactions is carried on by wire, not with other houses of business, but with agriculturists throughout the length and breadth of the country. I have to-day had our books examined, and find we have 1,060 customers of the name of 'Smith,' of which no less than 323 are 'John Smith;' 465 'Jones,' 96 of whom are 'John Jones;' 450 'Browns,' 87 'John Brown;' other surnames, such as 'Williams' and 'Robinson,' joined to other Christian names such as 'Richard' or 'Robert,' showing a similar relative proportion of identical appellations. Under such circumstances, I think you will not be surprised that we should be of a different opinion to the Postmaster General as to the address of the sender, except in the most abbreviated form, being mere surplusage. The name in such cases being of little use alone, the address of the sender is practically the only means by which he can be identified. A country resident's postal address seldom corresponds with, or even indicates, his nearest telegraph office. The postal address is often the only one with which we are acquainted, and as it would not be likely to occur to any one of the 323 'John Smiths' that we had another customer of the same name within 10 miles of him, any inducement such as that it is now proposed to hold out to him still further to curtail his address would make the identification of the actual sender of the telegram in question well nigh impossible. It thus appears to us that the system of charging for the address of the sender, leading, as it certainly must, to the omission of essential details, will be open to most serious objection."

It may be said that Mr. Sutton somewhat exaggerates the inconvenience of the change suggested by the right hon. Gentleman opposite; but again I say that I think that people who use the telegraph are the best judges in matters of this sort. Mr. Sutton insists that the address of the sender, no less than that of the receiver, should remain free. There can be no doubt that, if free addresses are abolished, the public will in many cases, without much consideration, cut off words from their addresses; and the change will cause increased complaints, numerous delays, irritation, vexation, and agitation. They will, therefore, discard any attempt to curtail the addresses, but will continue them at what they believe to be the necessary length. Let me take another class whose claims ought not to be disregarded in the consideration of this question, and which is entirely opposed to the abolition of free addresses. Miss Anne Bromhead, the Lady Superintendent of the Institute for Nurses, Lincoln, a very well-known lady, has written to the editor of *The Times*, and what does she say?—

> "Sir, will you allow me to add my protest to that of Messrs. Sutton and Sons against the doctrine of the Postmaster General, that 'the name and address of the sender of a telegram are, except in the most abbreviated form, mere surplusage?' I am quite sure that those who have the management of institutions for sending out trained nurses — of which there are now, happily, a large number throughout the Kingdom—would be very far from agreeing with him. A large part of our business is conducted by telegrams from quite unknown senders, generally requiring answers by telegraph; and any inducement to curtail the information given in the addresses would be productive of the greatest trouble, and often of serious delay."

I should think that these are cases which ought specially to commend themselves to the favourable consideration of the Committee. I cannot imagine any class of cases to which the House of Commons should pay more attention than those connected with the sending of medical relief and assistance to patients. Miss Bromhead does not stand alone. Only the other day a Petition was presented by my hon. Friend the Member for the University of Glasgow (Mr. J. A. Campbell) from the Faculty of Physicians of that city, which in the strongest terms contends that the freedom of addresses should be maintained. This is a copy of the Petition presented by the Faculty of Physicians and Surgeons of Glasgow—

> "That your Petitioners, as representing the large body of the Medical Profession in the West of Scotland, and having also numerous licentiates practising in other parts of the United Kingdom, are deeply interested in any measure tending to cheapen and afford increased facilities for telegraphic communication. That a Bill is at present depending in your Honourable House, intituled 'A Bill to amend the Telegraph Acts, 1863 to 1868.' Your Petitioners approve the provisions of the said Bill so far as providing for increased facilities in the transmission of telegrams by Her Majesty's Post Office Department, aad tending to a lessened charge therefor. Your Memorialists would respectfully, however, point out that by the enactment of the provision contained in Subsection (1) of Clause 2 of said Bill that 'the names and addresses of the sender and addressee of the telegram' shall be counted as part of the message, the practical reduction in the existing charge for telegrams will be greatly minimized. They would further respectfully

submit that it is in the interest of the Postal Telegraph Service that the name and address of the person to whom the telegram is sent shall be full and distinct, so as to save time and trouble in the ascertainment of the proper person to whom it is deliverable. Your Petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that the Proviso to Sub-section 1 of Clause 2 of the said Bill be not enacted, but that the names and addresses of the sender and addressee of the telegram be as heretofore allowed free of charge, and that the said Bill with this and such other Amendments as to your Honourable House may seem meet may pass into law."

That is the representation made by the Medical Faculty of the West of Scotland. I have also a letter from an eminent physician, whose opinion, I am sure, the hon. Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron) will be disposed to regard with the greatest respect. Professor Gairdner, of Glasgow, writes to the following effect:—

"My experience as a physician leads me to believe that very considerable inconvenience will result to the Medical Profession and to their patients from the introduction of cheap telegrams unless the rule in operation at present that the addresses go free can be maintained. Merchants, lawyers, and others have their noted correspondents, and rarely communicate hurriedly with previously unknown persons; to them, therefore, this view of the case does not so readily occur. But medical practitioners are liable to be summoned at any time to the assistance of persons of whose mere existence they have never before heard, and cases may easily occur where a message of the greatest possible emergency may be transmitted without forethought as to the embarrassments arising from an imperfect address. In such cases the omission of even one or two words, either from undue economy, or from the habit acquired of using an unduly short form of address for telegraphic purposes, may cause the recipient of a telegram a very great deal of trouble."

I will not trouble the Committee by reading the whole of the letter; but I think the passages I have read will show that nothing can be stronger than the view of Professor Gairdner upon the subject. I am afraid that I may be wearying the Committee by reciting these opinions, and I will only refer to one more class to whom the abolition of free addresses would cause great inconvenience, and those are the officers, non-commissioned officers, and soldiers in Her Majesty's Service. I cannot conceive any class which deserves greater assistance on the part of the House of Commons than the soldiers who serve the Queen. We have all been thrilled with the accounts of their noble endurance, of the hardships they have gone through, and of the courage they have displayed in Egypt and in other countries. I have asked for information at Aldershot and the Curragh, in order to see what use is made of the present freedom of address. Some hon. Gentlemen say that one word would be sufficient for the address of the sender, and four words for the address of the receiver; and if people will not accommodate themselves to that system, then so much the worse for them. I do not take that view of the matter. What do the Committee think is the average length of the messages sent from three camps, 1,263 in number, during the last 12 months? The average is 16 words. Will anybody tell me that those soldiers, who found it necessary to send these long addresses, will be able in future to condense them to four words? I do not for one single moment believe it to be possible. Let us consider what a soldier has to do in order to identify himself. He has to send not only his own name, but the name of the regiment and of the company to which he belongs, as well as his number. And to whom are these telegrams sent? Soldiers' messages are usually sent to relatives in an obscure station of life, living probably in tenement houses, or small back streets, or courts in the large towns of this country and in the Metropolis. The address, therefore, is necessarily long; and to tell a soldier to cut down addresses which now average 16 words to four or five, or to require him to pay for it, is not, I contend, a proper and legitimate mode of reforming the existing system of telegraphic communication. I do entreat the Committee to reflect very seriously before they inflict so onerous a duty upon these people. In the same manner the messages sent to soldiers by their relatives require a large amount of description in order to identify them, and the claims of that class ought not to be overlooked. It is very difficult to cut down addresses with any degree of safety, and if any hon. Member doubts that let him try to do so with his own telegrams. There are many hon. Members who have had considerable experience in sending telegrams, and I would ask them, with their superior education and status, with the knowledge possessed of that status by the Telegraph Department, how they could reasonably cut down the address, as a general rule, upon every telegram they send to five words? I trust hon. Members will not vote for the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman opposite until they have tried this experiment, both in regard to sending and receiving. The right hon. Gentleman complains of the cost of this system of free addresses, which has been in operation for 16 years. Who else complains? Does anybody complain? I have heard no complaint by anyone outside the Department, though, no doubt, the officers of the Department think that the addresses are unnecessarily long, and that they impose unnecessary trouble and expense upon the Department. But I say that no complaint whatever as to addresses has come from the public outside, and the right hon. Gentleman bases his argument upon that. That being so, the question comes to this—is the Department created for the public, or the public for the Department? The right hon. Gentleman has referred to the foreign system, basing his arguments on the allegation that a charge for addresses prevails in nearly all foreign countries. It is said that foreign countries are a-head of us; but, as Englishmen, there are other things in which we are much a-head of foreign countries, and I claim that in giving free addresses we are a-head of, and not behind, foreign countries. Does any hon. Gentleman who has had experience of sending telegrams when abroad think that the method of charging for addresses is more convenient? My opinion, I confess, is to the contrary, and I regard it as a retrograde and a reactionary movement. How would the question of the addresses affect the people in many parts of Ireland, of Scotland, and especially in the Principality of Wales, where the same surnames are largely repeated in certain districts of the country? It is quite clear that unless there is a full, clear, and distinct address you could not distinguish one Jones, or Williams, or Macdonoly, or Daly from another, and great uncertainty would arise in the delivery of telegrams. Reference has been made to the number of streets of the same name in this Metropolis. Now, that is a very important consideration. I have had a Return drawn up of the number of streets of the same name in the Metropolis, and how many Albert Terraces are there? 61. How many Albert Villas? 54. Then there are 42 Albert Places; 34 Albert Roads; 34 Albert Cottages; 38 Avenue Roads; 60 Cambridge Terraces; 75 Charles Streets; 59 Church Streets—showing the great hold of the Established Church; 60 Cross Streets; 52 Elizabeth Places; 49 George Streets; 87 High Streets; 44 Hope Cottages; 64 John Streets; 43 King Streets; 58 Park Places; 65 Park Terraces; 70 Park Villas; 79 Prospect Places; 89 Rose Cottages; 60 Victoria Cottages; 66 Victoria Terraces; 54 William Streets, and so on throughout a very long list. I think I have said enough to show the necessity for the exercise of very great caution indeed before we proceed to abolish free addresses, under which I take leave to say that the telegraph system has extended in the most satisfactory and astonishing way, against which I believe there is no complaint or protest upon the part of the public, and no demand for the abolition of so easy, so convenient, and so satisfactory a system. There is one further consideration which I would entreat the Committee to reflect upon. It is this—that if we now, on this very specious calculation, abolish free addresses, we shall never get them back again. On the other hand, if the Committee is pleased to adopt the alternative scheme I suggest, there is nothing which would prevent its further application in the granting of more words for 6*d.* than I now propose, if more favourable estimates are hereafter realized than those which the admittedly clever officers of the Department anticipate. If the sanguine views of the hon. Member for Glasgow are correct, and if the telegraph revenue should improve, nothing would be easier than to allow five or six words for 6*d.* with free addresses, the maintenance of which would add to the contentment and satisfaction of the great mass of the telegraphing community of the country. But if you once abolish free addresses you may whistle for them afterwards. I have nothing further to say. I have felt it only right to express my views, entertaining, as I do, strong opinions on the subject. I will not detain the Committee further; but I will ask them to vote for the maintenance of the system of free addresses, in order to concede a 6*d.* telegram even if there be a complaint in the first instance that we give only a few words in the body of the telegram. There is very great elasticity in my scheme, because you can add words for every halfpenny; and, at any rate, it would work well until the anticipations of the hon. Member for Glasgow are fully and completely realized. I beg to move the Amendment of which I have given Notice.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 24, to leave out sub-section (1), in order to insert the words—"(1.) The charges for the transmission of written telegrams throughout the United Kingdom shall uniformly, and without regard to distance, be at a rate not exceeding sixpence for the first three words of each telegram, or for each telegram of less than three words, and not exceeding one halfpenny for each additional word;

"(2.) The names and addresses of the senders and receivers of written telegrams shall not be counted as part of the words for which payment shall be required,"—(*Lord John Manners,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: The course pursued by the noble Lord opposite (Lord John Manners) with reference to the Bill now before the House has been entirely satisfactory to me, and I have to thank him for the consideration he has shown both to the Bill and to myself. Holding, as the noble Lord does, so strong an opinion on the subject of free addresses, and objecting so strongly to the abolition of them, it was not to be expected that he would adopt the Bill *in toto.* I think, therefore, that the noble Lord has taken an extremely wise course in leaving the conduct of the Bill in my hands, and in proposing an alternative tariff to the scheme which is contained in the Bill. The noble Lord has admitted that my financial propositions are sound and fair. The Committee will recollect that on introducing the Bill I stated that in the very critical state of the finances of the telegraphic services, in my opinion, and in that of the Treasury, it was not possible to incur a greater loss than was proposed by the Bill, and which is estimated at £180,000. The noble Lord is now in a responsible position. He is responsible for the finances of the Department, and subject to the control of the Treasury; he finds himself under precisely the same rigid limits with regard to finance which I did. He has admitted that I was correct in my estimate, and he feels himself unable to propose to the Committee any alternative plan which would impose upon the Department a greater burden than I propose. Therefore, the two alternative plans, so far as the Department is concerned, are identical; and all the Committee has to consider is, whether the alternative of the noble Lord, or the scheme contained in the Bill, will be most convenient for the public. The noble Lord will, perhaps, excuse me for saying that the speech he has delivered to-night must have been prepared for delivery upon the second reading of the Bill. While objecting to the abolition of free addresses, the noble Lord has abstained from saying much in favour of his own proposal, and he has not quoted a single authority in support of it. I should like to know if any one of the persons he has quoted, either lady superintendent, physicians, or private traders, have really had under consideration the alternative scheme of the noble Lord? Can he produce a single authority, either in his own Department or outside of it, who will say that the alternative proposed by him is a satisfactory solution of the difficulty? I venture to maintain that there is not in the Department itself, throughout the whole telegraphic service, a single individual who will say that the proposal made by the noble Lord is satisfactory, or who will deny that it would lead to great dissatisfaction on the part of the public, and give rise to new agitation. I shall not follow the noble Lord in the precise line he has taken. What I propose to do is to compare the two alternatives before the Committee, which are admitted to have the same financial results. It will then be for the Committee to consider which is the better one. The noble Lord proposes to retain free addresses, and to charge 6*d.* for three words. My proposal is to give 12 words for 6*d.*; abolishing free addresses, and rising by 1*d.* for every additional two words; but I am quite prepared to accept the suggestion of my hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron), and substitute ½*d.* per word. Therefore, from 6*d.* upwards, the tariff of the two schemes would be practically the same. The only question is, what it is to be given for 6*d.*—three words, with a free address, or 12 words without. The calculation I received from the permanent officers of the Department was that, if free addresses were abolished, five words, on the average, would be required for the address, and seven would remain for the contents of the message. Therefore, my seven words would compare favourably with the three words of the noble Lord. The noble Lord meets this by saying that the number of words required for a free address is altogether unknown. That I deny; I have had an investigation made of a large number of telegrams, which show that the addresses could be reduced, if necessary, to five words or four, and even to three; but that the average would be five words. That, of course, is subject to the concession made to the hon. Member for Glasgow, that figures up to five in number should be counted as one word, and that the name of the sender need not be transmitted. I repeat again, that the result of a very long investigation of telegrams showed conclusively that the average in future would be five words, and not 11, as is now the case. The Committee can hardly be aware of the great waste which now takes place in telegraphing addresses, and the large number of unnecessary words used in addresses. This waste cripples the energies of the Staff of the Department, causes delay in the transmission of telegrams, and entails a large cost on the Department. I should like to give the Committee two or three illustrations of the waste of words used in telegrams. I called upon the officer of the Department to give me some examples of wasted and superfluous addresses. He produced three cases. The first was that of a milliner at Dover who used 32 words in describing her address. The next was that of a noble Earl who had gained some advantage upon a Bill in Parliament, and in telegraphing the result of his success to a Justice of the Peace in a distant county he used 46 words in describing his own address and that of his friend. The third instance was from a person who ought to have known better; in point of fact, it was the late Postmaster General—myself. I had telegraphed from the House of Commons to the head of the Telegraph Department, informing him that this Bill would not come on, and I used 11 words for the two addresses. It was pointed out to me that three would have been amply sufficient, and probably if I had had to pay for the addresses I should have saved eight of them, or otherwise 4*d*., and should have confined myself to the three alone that were necessary. I would undertake to say that, having gone through a considerable number of telegrams, there is not one of them which does not contain waste and superfluous verbiage in the shape of addresses. I have, therefore, come to the conclusion that it is absolutely necessary, in the interest of the senders of telegrams themselves, to impose some limit in order to prevent the transmission of superfluous and unnecessary words, and I think that the only way of doing this is to give the senders of telegrams an interest in curtailing their addresses. According to the view of the Department, the average number of unnecessary words used in telegrams is six. If, in future, there are six unnecessary words in every telegram, and if they are multiplied by 30,000,000, the number of telegrams which it is expected will be despatched annually when this Bill becomes law, they would amount to 23 per cent of all the words sent over the wires by the Post Office. It follows, then, that if 23 per cent of the words telegraphed through the Post Office are useless and unnecessary, the very lowest estimate I can make of the cost of telegraphing these useless and unnecessary words is £250,000 a-year. Is it not worth while to make some effort, even at the sacrifice of convenience to some classes of the community, for the purpose of saving so large a sum as £250,000 annually, which would otherwise be paid, not by the Department, as the noble Lord appears to think, but by the senders of telegrams? That is the real proposition before us. The noble Lord proposes, in his alternative scheme, to give free addresses and three words for 6*d*. Why does the noble Lord limit himself to three words? It is on account of the great cost of the superfluous words sent in the addresses. He is necessarily limited to three words of the text, because he does not like to interfere with free addresses. If the noble Lord could reduce these superfluous words and add them to the text and message, he would be able to give more words for 6*d*. Three words in the text are insufficient for almost any message, and I have come to the conclusion that not one message in 40 would be sent for 6*d*. under the noble Lord's tariff. Inasmuch as there would be the same inducement under the noble Lord's tariff as there would be under mine to cut down the words in the text as much as possible, I have come to the conclusion that under the noble Lord's tariff the senders of telegrams would have to pay in every case for four additional words. The transmission of those four additional words, if multiplied by 30,000,000, would cost £260,000, which almost exactly meets the cost of telegraphing superfluous words in the addresses. Therefore, I believe my contention is right, that the charge of £260,000 a-year caused by telegraphing superfluous and unnecessary words, in the shape of addresses, will fall on the senders of telegrams, who will have to pay for it by telegraphing four additional words. Allow me to make a comparison between the two tariffs. Under the noble Lord's tariff, according to the best calculation I have been able to make, certainly not one telegram in 40 would be sent for 6*d*. The average cost to the sender of telegrams, in consequence of the necessity of sending four extra words in the text, would be 2*d*. Therefore, every telegram sent under the noble Lord's tariff would cost 2*d*. more than the average telegram sent under mine. Under my tariff it is calculated that 40 per cent of the telegrams would be sent for 6*d*.; whereas under the tariff of the noble Lord only one telegram in 40 would be sent for 6*d*. This is not an assumption, but is founded on a careful investigation of a large number of telegrams. The Committee will recollect that when I introduced the Bill I met the argument that the tariff was likely to fall hardly upon the working classes by the statement that I had obtained as many telegrams as I could which had been sent by working men. It was rather difficult to collect them; but I succeeded in collecting about 157 telegrams sent by working men. I had them examined and compressed within reasonable limits, and it was found that by compressing them, not in a very scientific manner as the noble Lord appears to think, but in a reasonable manner, 71 of those telegrams could be sent for 6*d*., and that the average charge for each of the 157 telegrams would be 7½*d*. I have lately applied to the same telegrams, compressed in the way I have described, the noble Lord's tariff, and the result was that not 71, but only four could be sent for 6*d*., and that the average charge on the whole of the 157 telegrams would be 1½*d*. more than under the tariff of this Bill. I wish, then, to ask the noble Lord when he pleads the cause of the working man, which of the two tariffs the working man would prefer? Would he prefer the one under which only four out of 157 could be sent for 6*d*., or the tariff under which 71 out of 157 could be sent for 6*d*.? I should like to take the opinion of the working men themselves as to which of the two tariffs on the whole they would think the best. I venture to say that the tariff of the noble Lord in this respect is not to be compared with mine. It appears to me, therefore, that the tariff introduced by the noble Lord can be in no sense called a 6*d*. telegram. The telegrams that would be sent under it for 6*d*. are so few in number that, practically, it cannot be called a 6*d*. telegram; but although there would be a large number over 6*d*. under the tariff of the Bill, still the number sent for 6*d*. would be very considerable, and therefore would be a great boon to people who make use of the telegraphs. The noble Lord has quoted various classes of people who object to the tariff of the Bill, and amongst others he has mentioned a very important firm from the town which I have the honour to represent—Messrs. Sutton, of Reading. No doubt, Messrs. Sutton have written to the newspapers objecting to the tariff I have proposed; but I have reason to believe that if the whole of their telegrams could be examined at the Post Office, I should be able to give a complete answer to the statements which have been made. I asked for permission to peruse their telegrams for that purpose, promising not to make use of the contents; but Messrs. Sutton have not had the fairness to allow the examinations to be made. I will not trouble the Committee by referring to the arguments the noble Lord used in reference to the cases of non-commissioned officers and soldiers. I apprehend that it is not very often that a non-commissioned officer or a private in the Army makes use of the telegraph service at all, nor do I pretend to say that there may not, in some cases, be an inequality in the waste arising from the nature of the address; but I would ask the House to consider what is the difference between the cases mentioned by the noble Lord of streets in London where it is necessary to give the name of a second street in order to define the address accurately. Two words would cover all the difference. Even conceding an extra two words, and comparing the tariff of the noble Lord with my own, I believe that mine would be a better one for the public than that of the noble Lord. After all, there is bound to be a certain inequality in the addresses. A very large number of addresses would require only three words; others would require four; but the average, I believe, would be five. And with this average there cannot be a question that the tariff of the Bill would be much more favourable by comparison than that of the noble Lord. Let me point out to the Committee, assuming I am right in regard to the average number of words contained in the address, what the difference is between the tariff of the noble Lord and my own. In all cases where the addresses are under nine words the sender of a telegram would be better off under my tariff than under that of the noble Lord. By the noble Lord's scheme a message of 15 words would cost 1*s.*; whereas under my tariff, assuming the average number of words in the address to be five, 19 words in the text of the message would only cost 1*s.* Therefore, on all these points my tariff compares favourably with that of the noble Lord, and from whatever point of view the Committee look at the question I think they will come to the conclusion that the tariff of the noble is an unsatisfactory one, and that the tariff proposed in the Bill is a far better one for the public. I will not detain the Committee any longer upon this question; but there is one other point I wish to call attention to if the noble Lord will give me his attention. It is a point to which I know the officers of the Department attach very great importance; and it is that, if only three words are conceded in the text, there is very great danger that the senders of messages will use part of the address as a code. I have heard from a merchant of Glasgow that already addresses are occasionally employed in that way, for the purpose of saving money in the body of the message itself. To some extent, I am told, that is already done, and the permanent officers of the Department have every reason to believe that the practice would extend. I am quite sure that the Department has informed the noble Lord that considerable danger will arise if the tariff he proposes be adopted. Putting all things together and taking a broad view of the case, I will conclude by summing up what I consider to be the superior advantages of my scheme over that of the noble Lord. By the noble Lord's tariff only three words are conceded; secondly, every sender of a telegram would be required to pay for four extra words as compared with the tariff in the Bill; thirdly, the average charge for each message would be from 1½*d.* to 2*d.* more than under the Bill; and, lastly, no less than £250,000 a-year would be expended by the senders of telegrams in useless addresses. That sum of £250,000 would have to be paid by the public in consequence of the limited number of words allowed in the text. On the other hand, the tariff I have introduced in the Bill is a very simple one, and the Department would be saved the cost of telegraphing 23 per cent of useless words and addresses.

MR. GRAY said, that however much the country and the Committee had to congratulate themselves on other accounts on the change of Government, he thought it would be unfortunate if the scheme of the Government were carried out in its entirety. The granting of free addresses was not for the purpose of restricting the service of the public, but for increasing it. He infinitely preferred the plan of the late to that of the present Postmaster General. The Committee were called upon to decide upon the proposition of the late Government, which the noble Lord opposed when it was introduced, on the ground that it did not give the people sufficient facilities, and yet the scheme now proposed by the noble Lord himself would give them less. Between the two propositions the Committee were called upon to decide whether they ought to have the number of words proposed by the late Postmaster General without free addresses, or the limited number of words proposed by the noble Lord with free addresses. His (Mr. Gray's) opinion was that they should have the number of words given by the late Postmaster General, together with the free addresses proposed by the noble Lord when he was untrammelled by the cares of Office. He was inclined to think that, if the Department were more carefully managed, a message of 12 words and free addresses might be given for 6*d.* without incurring any loss at all to the Revenue. He thought he was in a position to give an instance, for the consideration of the Committee, to show how expensively the entire Department was worked. When the telegraphs were taken over by the State in 1870, an arrangement was in existence with regard to Press messages. The old Telegraph Companies were in the habit of supplying the Press with news at a certain rate. The Telegraph Companies collected the news themselves and transmitted it to the newspapers at a fixed annual sum, which was estimated to cost, upon a number of words transmitted, about 4*d.* or 4½*d.* per 100 words. After a careful investigation, it was decided that about one-half of that cost was incurred in the collection of news, and the other half was due to the transmission of news. Of course, it was impossible for the Government Department to undertake the collection of news; and, therefore, when the Government came into possession of the wires, they entered into an arrangement with the representatives of the Press of the United Kingdom, by which Press messages were to be sent at the rate of 2½*d.* per 100 words. He believed the Department asserted that the Press service now involved a loss to the country of something like £150,000 or £200,000 a-year. As one who was connected with and deeply interested in the Press, he failed to see why the Government should subsidize the Press of the United Kingdom to the extent of £200,000 a-year; and if it were the fact that the Press service cost the country so much money, he did not see why the late Postmaster General and the present Postmaster General should have avoided that subject, and not dealt with the question of Press rates. It would have been easy to say that the Press were receiving from the Government more than they were entitled to; and if it were found that the Government were carrying on a Press system at an unremunerative rate, Parliament might be asked to revise the tariff. He therefore asked the noble Lord to tell the Committee whether that was the fact or not. The officials of the Department alleged that the Department was now under a heavy loss arising from the transmission of Press messages. The reason why he alluded to that point was not that he had any strong desire to see the charge for Press messages increased, but to point out that if the old Telegraph Companies found it remunerative to send Press messages at the rate of 2*d.* for 100 words, the Committee ought to be told why the Government were unable to do the same without incurring an enormous loss. If it were really the fact, it was quite evident that the cost of the service under Government management had been enormously increased. If the profit which the Telegraph Companies were able to make had been converted into a loss of £200,000 a-year to the Government, it was only fair and reasonable to conclude that the Telegraph Service under the control of the Post Office was carried on at an extravagant rate. If that were so, they had arrived at the real cause why a telegraphic service equal to the Continental service could not be given to the public of this country. What cost 2*d.* on the Continent cost 4*d.* in this country. He entertained a strong opinion that a service for which 1*s.* was now charged could be carried on properly for 6*d.*, and he certainly thought that the present 1*s.* telegram, with free addresses, might be sent for 6*d.* if the Department were worked as economically as the old Companies performed the same service for the benefit of their shareholders, seeing that the old Companies were able to conduct the service and realize a considerable profit from it. He had no doubt that the proposal of the noble Lord would be much less advantageous to the public than that which was at present contained in the Bill. Without intending any disrespect towards the noble Lord, he could only suppose that it was simply a desire to be consistent which made the noble Lord now propose free addresses at the expense of the message itself. The present proposition was absolutely ludicrous. What the public wanted was free addresses and an adequate number of words in the message itself. He trusted that before the Committee ceased its labours, the question he had put to the Government in reference to Press messages would receive elucidation. It was quite evident that if a Service which was originally carried on at a profit, now involved a loss of £200,000 a-year, there must be something radically wrong with regard to it, and that it must be carried on at an extravagant cost.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER (Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH): The Government could certainly not agree to give, as the hon. Member suggests, a larger number of words and free addresses. I must repeat the words of my Predecessor in the Office I have now the honour to hold, that we cannot impose upon the Treasury a larger burden than it is now called upon to bear. The choice lies between the scheme of the late Postmaster General and that of my noble Friend, and the Government are prepared to carry out whichever of those alternative proposals the Committee prefer. More than that I cannot say; and I can now only appeal to the Committee, considering the hour at which we have arrived, to go to a division at once.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 62; Noes 108: Majority 46.—(Div. List, No. 256.)

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that in pursuance of the arrangement which had been entered into, he would now move to report Progress.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre.*)

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL said, that after the result of the division he did not propose to move any further Amendments.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

House *resumed.*

Bill *reported*, without Amendment, to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

[*Lords.*]—[BILL 159.]

(*Secretary Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS and Mr. HOPWOOD rising together, Mr. SPEAKER called upon the former.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): I rise to move, Sir, that you do leave the Chair, and I will not detain the House more than one or two minutes. I simply want to say that this Bill deals with questions of a very grave character, and though I regret that some time has elapsed between its second reading and the Motion that you, Sir, do leave the Chair, yet, as the right hon. Gentleman beside me (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) has stated to the House to-day, we shall go on with the consideration of the measure from day to day until the Committee is closed. This is a question which has stirred England from one end to the other. ["Oh, oh!"] An hon. Member expresses dissent; but I am bound to repeat the statement which I have already made—that there is nothing more sacred to the English people, and there is nothing which they are so determined to maintain, as the purity of their own households. The feeling has gone abroad that the purity of their households and the honour of their daughters has been and is liable to be violated, and they have made up their minds that this shall no longer be the case. I do not know what reasons the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) and others who intend to oppose your leaving the Chair can possibly bring forward upon this question; but I am surprised that any Amendment should have been put upon the Paper against the proposal, and they will have to answer to the public and to their constituencies for their action in this case. All I, on behalf of Her Majesty's Government, can say is that, as far as we are concerned, we are determined, as far as we can within ordinary and proper limits, that the purity of the households of this country shall be maintained, and that those who wish to violate them shall be punished. I beg to move, Sir, that you do now leave the Chair.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair." —(*Secretary Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Mr. HOPWOOD, in rising to move the following Amendment:—

> "That, in view of the fact that there already exists much legislation of the kind, little known or resorted to, and that besides much of it is of a contradictory character partly for the regulation and partly for the repression of vice, it is expedient that further inquiry and more deliberation be given to the subject before proceeding with the said Committee,"

said, that he could not understand why the right hon. Gentleman opposite (the Secretary of State for the Home Department) had interfered with the ordinary course, and interposed between the House and the Motion of which he (Mr. Hopwood) had given Notice, unless it were for the indecent purpose—[*Interruption, and emphatic cries of* "Order!" *and* "Withdraw!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: That is not a proper expression for the hon. and learned Member to use——

Mr. HOPWOOD: I withdraw—["Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: It is out of Order, and I hope the hon. and learned Member will withdraw it.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, that he had, at once, withdrawn the word; and he would say, with leave, instead, that it was an unbecoming attack on those who, like himself, were as much moved by a sense of duty as the right hon. Gentleman, and who were doing their duty to their constituencies quite as much as the right hon. Gentleman, who, though now riding upon a storm created by sensational statements of a filthy character in a public journal, many of them being untrue, while others only dealt with well-known phases of immorality, common to every large city in the world, nevertheless had for years acquiesced in the state of things he was now so anxious to amend. He (Mr. Hopwood) could show that the right hon. Gentleman himself was one who had resisted on a former occasion the raising of the age of protection. It was possible that he should find himself alone in the course which he was following. He should, nevertheless, continue in it, because he deprecated any change in the law, except where it was shown and proved to be necessary; and, secondly, it should then be discussed calmly, for there were dangers to be considered in the Bill which were of such a serious nature that before the Bill was allowed to come into law they should carefully consider what its effect was likely to be. If the House of Commons was not to keep its head clear, and preserve a dispassionate coolness in a time of clamour and panic like the present, upon what institution could the country rely for advice and guidance? Whom else could they look upon as their saviour? He deprecated all talk about the purity of homes and the inviolable sanctity of the family as inflammatory. He considered he had a perfect right to discuss the question; and with regard to those, if there were any, who doubted whether he took a wholesome interest in this subject, he would remind them that the very last Act passed for the protection of childhood was drafted by him and passed through the House by him with very little help, indeed, from other hon. Members. As his character seemed now to be impugned, he would call evidence in support of his statements from that undeniable source, the Statute Book of the Realm. He referred to the Act which declared that consent on the part of a child to participation in filthy practices should no longer be a valid defence. Those hon. Members who were ready to hurry the present Bill through the House at all hazards, knew nothing about the evils of which they were making so much ado, and would have taken no steps except for the publication of some sensational and inflammatory stories in a public print which they were innocent enough to believe. There were full-grown men in the House who now, forsooth, were so shocked with what they had read and heard that they could rest neither by day nor night until this Bill was passed; but, for his part, he thought it was discreditable to them to pretend not to have known that much depravity had existed in London in all times. Had hon. Members who were in such a fume about the passing of this measure ever practised before a Judge and jury and seen a wretched man in peril in consequence of a false accusation? Writings of a sensational and scandalous nature had been circulated abroad, and those who pretended to take the matter up under the plea that their own ignorance had been shocked by the disclosures contained in them did little service to the community by encouraging the further publication of such offensive stuff. If the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Bradlaugh), whom he regretted not to see in his place, had only published one-half of that which had appeared in *The Pall Mall Gazette*, the cry would have been, "Prosecute him, prosecute him!" When they were told that it had been done in the service of humanity, he wondered at the innocence of those who put it thus. It was not the language of truth. It was sentimental, inflammatory language, written with a spice "to make it read" as attractive as such vile filth could be made. The greater part of the publication was untrue, and that part of it which was true hon. Members already knew, and it was hypocrisy for them to pretend that they did not know of the existence of such crimes in London and other cities throughout not only England, but the Universe, before they saw it proclaimed under the voucher of the Editor of *The Pall Mall Gazette*. But before introducing fresh legislation the promoters of the Bill must prove that the existing law was not sufficiently strong to deal with the matter. The Law of Rape would not be improved by the passing of this Bill. What they wanted was detection of crime, and not a multiplicity of Acts of Parliament which could be of no practical service. The laws as to rape and the offence of decoying girls under 14 were applicable to more than nine-tenths of the cases which had been brought to the notice of the public. The real agitation came to this—a very sensentional newspaper had taken up the cause of morality, and had argued it from motives of its own; and a large Society in the country, which also traded upon the weaknesses of mankind while it professed to direct its higher aims towards religion, had also taken it up. He referred to the Salvation Army, which, in this matter, provided that religion should be served, combined with a good investment of its funds, for the purpose of gratifying personal ends. If this Bill were carried forward, he wished its promoters joy of their success; but he was sure that they would live to rue it. The House should be careful not to relieve women of their individual responsibility, while paying no regard to the dangers from designing females to the young of the other sex. It had been said publicly by a benevolent friend of his, to whom society owed a great deal (Mr. S. Morley), that with reference to this matter there was one law for the rich and one for the poor. Great caution ought to be observed before using inflammatory language of that kind. The law was perfectly equal both for the rich and the poor. It might, perhaps, be said that the protection of the Court of Chancery could not be taken advantage of by the poor man; but he (Mr. Hopwood) contended even that might be secured by investing some £20 to £100 and making a girl a ward of Court. It was, therefore, most unjust to make use of expressions which would work upon the mind of the poor man by leading him to believe that there was one law for the rich and another for the poor. One great evil—one upon which he must address a solemn warning to the House, as likely to be the result of such legislation as this—was the increase of the danger of extortion by means of false charges. If such a measure became law there would practically be no protection for youths and the sons of persons of position. There were cases in which girls were steeped in depravity at the ages of 13 to 16 years; and he believed that if the Bill were allowed to pass there would be great danger of young men and even boys being betrayed by designing creatures, whose object was to levy "black mail." Such cases of extortion had occurred in the past, and they abounded, he regretted to say, under the present law. It might be said that because such cases of extortion abounded under the present state of the law, such a contingency would be inseparable from all law; but he would point out that the peculiar danger of such a measure was that there was no other law under which a party to the act complained of was allowed to be a complainant and a witness against the other party. Abandoned and profligate fathers and mothers, as well as girls themselves, might make the provisions of this Bill a means of extortion. Then, again, he could not conceive why protection should be afforded to one party alone; and he asked those who heard him whether there was not something in the Bill that struck home to them as affecting their own sons, which might well make them cautious how they passed the Bill? False charges were even made under the present law, as was shown by the case of the Rev. Mr. Hatch, recorded in *The Annual Register*, 1860, which was one of the most appalling instances of the depravity to which children could fall. This gentleman had two little girls of 11 and eight years of age, whose names were Plummer, consigned to his care to be educated. They were taken away after a few days by their mother, and a very short time afterwards the rev. gentleman learned that a most revolting charge had been made against him of committing indecent assaults upon them. The offence was alleged to have been committed in the presence of his wife. The story was told with such a clever simulation of artless innocence, that a jury, in the Central Criminal Court, convicted him, and he was sentenced to two years' imprisonment on each of two indictments. His wife was by law, of course, precluded from giving evidence in the case. Six months afterwards the case was further investigated, and the eldest of these young girls was convicted of perjury; and after enduring for this period all the indignities and humiliations consequent upon his conviction, he was pardoned for an offence which he never committed. This was a striking illustration of the dangers that might arise, especially from abandoned girls of older years. There was certainly a very strong feeling out-of-doors on this subject at the present time, and he believed that it was a revulsion of feeling caused by the administration of the Contagious Diseases Acts. Women had been so exasperated by that insult to womanhood that they would not stop short of reprisals. There had been a great deal of talk which plainly showed how little those who were taking the lead in clamouring for the passing of this Bill knew of what the present law was. He contended that the ordinary law contained all that was necessary in order to deal with cases of abduction and the offence of procuring females up to the age of 21 years. By Statute it was a crime to procure the defilement of any girl under that age, and to decoy a child under 14 was also a felony. In the case of heiresses there was also a severe penalty imposed upon those who, for the purposes of lucre, took them away from their guardians. No case had been made out for this storm of indignation and this loud demand for the amendment of the law. They had heard a great deal of noise made in the country concerning alleged revelations made by an evening newspaper. He, however, desired proof of these sweeping assertions before he would believe them, and he maintained that they ought to be subjected to the consideration of a Select Committee. They should promise the persons who made them a hearing for everything they should urge in support of their case, and next Session an inquiry ought to be instituted to find out whether the statements were true or not. The editor of this paper, however, said he could not tell the public his authority for the statements he had published, because he had promised not to tell their names; but he (Mr. Hopwood) would ask why these statements were produced to a so-called Commission of Prelates and Cardinals, and yet could not be made public? If the seal of secrecy was broken for the one, it ought to be broken for the other. Why were statements of this kind, assailing the character of England and Englishmen, allowed to go broadcast over the Continent of Europe and the United States of America? Let them have an inquiry into them in order to see whether they possessed one-tenth part of the foundation which was claimed for them. He denied that the law of other countries was essentially different from the law of England. After a comparison of portions of the French and German law with the existing English law framed for the protection of minors, he said that in none was 14 years exceeded, and in the vast majority a younger age was the limit. The only thing which he noticed was that while upon the Continent they were always logical in their legislation, in England they were not. He had another reflection to make. He had described to the House the case of the Rev. Mr. Hatch, and he wished now to refer to the extraordinary proposition in the name of the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) to administer the vulgar and commonplace punishment of flogging. He said so because it was always the remedy to which the rash and thoughtless resorted. Well, he would ask the House what would they think if, in such a case as that of the Rev. Mr. Hatch, he had had, in addition to the many indignities which he had been compelled to suffer innocently, his back torn, gashed, and bleeding by the cruel thongs at the bidding of some zealous Member of Parliament? Why, it would be a disgrace to the House of Commons to pass the clause. All he could say was that he hoped it might not be considered an uncharitable wish that some of those Gentlemen who seriously joined in the support of such a provision might some day be the objects of a false accusation, and might be enabled to know in the hour of trial what it was to suffer personal pain inflicted by brutal and horrible torture. In former years for almost every offence the lash had been tried as a means of repressing crime; but he would like to ask what had ever been gained by flaying the naked backs of unfortunate people? In connection with this subject he felt bound to condemn, in the strongest possible language, the Contagious Diseases Acts, which, he maintained, deprived a woman of her liberty, reducing her to the position of a mere human chattel. In conclusion, he would apologize to the House for the plainness of his language, and the length of time which he had occupied in discharging a duty, with the gravity and importance of which he was fully impressed, and would now move the Amendment of which he had given Notice.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in view of the fact that there already exists much legislation of the kind, little known or resorted to, and that besides much of it is of a contradictory character partly for the regulation and partly for the repression of vice, it is expedient that further inquiry and more deliberation be given to the subject before proceeding with the said Committee,"—(*Mr. Hopwood,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he was sure that everyone would respect the motives that had induced the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Hopwood) to express what he (Sir William Harcourt) had no doubt were his sincere convictions. At the same time, they must feel that the desire of the House was to proceed with the Bill, and not to embark on a long and protracted discussion upon the Speaker leaving the Chair. A good deal of what the hon. and learned Member said was a suggestion that this Bill was the offspring of a sudden panic due to recent occurrences. This was not so. This Bill was framed three years ago, when there was, and had been for some years before, a great and well-founded complaint of traffic in girls taking place abroad, especially in Belgium. Soon after he (Sir William Harcourt) came to the Home Office, five years ago, he had ordered an inquiry to be made into the matter, and the Report of that inquiry, which was prepared by Mr. Snagg, became the foundation for the Committee of the House of Lords, and their Report in turn became the foundation of this Bill, which had been several times introduced. The Bill had been taken up, after due consideration and with the conviction that there was a great evil which required a remedy. The Bill had been carefully considered by the other House of Parliament; it came down to the House of Commons after several years' consideration, and the time had now come when the House of Commons was determined to deal with the question. He thought the sooner they got into Committee and considered what Amendments ought to be made in the Bill, the better it would be for the thorough discharge of their task, and that the more especially as it seemed that the House were evidently not in favour of the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member.

MR. WARTON said, he, for one, whatever time it might take, intended to express his opinion on the Bill. He considered it a duty and a right to speak—a duty, because he felt strongly upon the question; and a right, because he had been one of the persons who had been foully slandered by an evening paper, *The Pall Mall Gazette.* That was a newspaper which had lived on sensation. It had been saved from ruin by the "Amateur Casual;" it had invented the "dog fight;" and now it had invented this story about the streets of London. With reference to the Committee which had been appointed to consider the statements published by that newspaper, he begged to enter his protest against a Committee so constituted. It was composed of three ecclesiastics, the hon. Member for Hereford, and the hon. Member for Bristol (Mr. Samuel Morley), and nearly every one of those Gentlemen, with the single exception of the Archbishop of Canterbury, had been distinguished as a fanatic in one shape or another, and he protested against those Gentlemen constituting themselves a Committee on such a serious question as this. They had given the go-by to the names of individuals; they had refused to enter into the accusations against the police; and yet they had said that, on the whole, the statements were substantially true. No man in his senses could doubt that there must be in a City like London, with its millions of population, some men who were thoroughly depraved in their morals; but that vice of this kind was so prevalent as stated was not to be believed for a moment. He had said that his (Mr. Warton's) name had been brought into this abominable production. Not only was he libelled in *The Pall Mall Gazette*, but even the right hon. Gentleman the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt) did not escape. The object of the promoters of the Bill—ill-conditioned Democrats and Salvationist sentimentalists—was to set class against class. Look at the audacious and reckless mendacity of that abominable newspaper. It said that a certain house in St. John's Wood was resorted to by one Prince and one Cabinet Minister—that, of course, could not refer to the present Cabinet, as it was written before the Conservatives came into power. He strongly complained of the sensational articles published by that journal being allowed to be sold promiscuously in the streets of London, whereby, he ventured to say, more demoralization would be caused than could possibly be prevented in the next 10 years by the legislation now under discussion, even if the House should consent to adopt it. He also commented severely on the attempt which was being made in connection with that question to sow a bitter feeling between different classes of the community. With that view, it was scandalously alleged that the daughters of the working men were to be the victims and slaves of those above them in rank; for there was nothing more congenial to the ill-conditioned Democrat than to cast foul slanders and aspersions on the higher orders of society. He reminded those who thought they might stop the mischievous agitation now on foot by adopting any moderate compromise on the question of age, that meeting after meeting of fools and fanatics had been called to pass cut-and-dried resolutions on that subject, got up in a very questionable manner, the movers and seconders of them not even knowing their own minds or understanding in the slightest degree the subject with which they were dealing. For instance, in one case where it was proposed to raise the age of protection to 18, a man shouted out that the age should be 21, whereupon the meeting unanimously came to a vote in favour of the latter age.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he would not have troubled the House in the matter, were it not that he had lately received a large number of anonymous letters, professing to come from those who agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld). To the statement of the right hon. Gentleman opposite the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt) denying that they were asked to legislate under the influence of panic, he desired to give the most absolute contradiction. He wished to know why, if the measure was so necessary for the preservation of a proper state of society, and for the protection of women and girls, the late Home Secretary did not propose it to the House at a more reasonable time of the Session, when it could have been properly discussed? Last year they heard nothing about it; and this year the Motion for the second reading was brought on just before the rising of this House for the Whitsun Recess. Why was his (Mr. Bentinck's) right hon. Friend the present Home Secretary not in his place on that occasion? The hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) knew that the Bill was likely to come on for second reading, and yet he ran away. He (Mr. Bentinck) did not object to the Bill; on the contrary, he was most anxious that proper protection should be afforded to women and girls, so long as extortion by women on the male sex was not promoted. But he believed that this matter was now brought forward as an electioneering cry, and attempts had been made to use it as a means of irritating the humbler classes against those above them in circumstances. The present Home Secretary had allowed the sale of publications to go on unchecked which ought to have been stopped. The late Home Secretary also had been guilty of grave official negligence in not bringing the Bill on at an earlier period of the Session, when it could have received a discussion which was at present impossible. But for the publications to which reference had been made, he did not believe that the House would have been so full as it was on the present occasion. The conduct of the Government in allowing abominable newspapers to be sold about the streets was a disgrace to civilization—it was a disgrace to the Home Secretary. When he (Mr. Bentinck) was at a public school, if he were found with a copy of such a paper as that in his pocket, he would be soundly flogged; and when he was at the University, he might have been rusticated for the same offence. He would like to read some of the opinions which the late Home Secretary gave on the subject years ago; but, of course, there was no greater master of the political morality of public men than the right hon. Gentleman. ["Oh, oh!"] He had no intention of opposing the Motion to go into Committee on the Bill; but he desired that there should be a full discussion of the clauses of the measure, unwarped and unprejudiced by the reprehensible agitation which had been going on out-of-doors, the result being that the deliberations of the Committee would result in wise and beneficent legislation.

SIR FREDERICK MILNER said, with reference to the statement of the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) that the measure had only been proceeded with by Her Majesty's Government in consequence of the publications and agitation that had taken place, he could undoubtedly assert that it was the intention of the present Government, as soon as it came into Office, to pass this Bill into law. He would also remind hon. Members that the House of Lords had on three different occasions provided for the better protection of the unfortunate children of the poor in this country. He was of opinion that legislation was necessary to deal with the state of crime which had been revealed. It was true that the accounts might have been exaggerated; but if one-tenth part were true, it was necessary for the House to deal with the evil. He believed that the law also required amendment by the institution of a Court of Criminal Appeal and by altering the Law of Evidence so as to make it competent for married women to give evidence against their husbands in cases in which they were the accused parties.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he would not put the House to the trouble of a division.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Short title) *agreed to.*

PART I.

Protection of Women and Girls.

Clause 2 (Procuring woman to be a common prostitute or to enter a brothel).

MR. ELTON said, he hoped the Committee would approve of the principle of the Amendment he was about to move. It was as follows:—

> In page 1, after line 9, insert the following sub-section:—"(1) Procures, or by persistent persuasion or other importunity, or by offer or holding out of reward or hope of reward, endeavours to procure any woman or girl not being a common prostitute, to have unlawful connexion, either within or without the Queen's dominions, with any other person or persons; or."

The object of the Amendment was twofold, and was intended to punish two distinct offences. The first was the offence of procuring young persons to have illicit connection; and the second was to punish the persistent or aggravated attempt to procure persons to have connection, even although such attempt did not result in the commission of the offence. He thought that they ought to extend the punishment under this clause to those persons who were guilty of persistently luring and debauching the minds of young girls, even although the actual act was not carried out. They did not wish to punish the mere suggestion or licentious talk of young people; but they wanted to meet the case of those professionals who committed the offence habitually, and therefore might be taken to make it into a profession. In fact, the people they wished to attack were those whose proper place would be at the cart-tail—the pimps and bawds they had heard of of old. Besides those there were those professional procurers and rascally kidnappers who lurked at ports and stations and thievish corners of the streets, in order to entrap the ill-protected daughters of the working classes to houses of ill-fame at home, or to send them for evil purposes abroad. One of the best results of this Amendment, he anticipated, would be the retirement of those sly and quiet procuresses who kept on the safe side of the law. They were always anxious to know what the law was, and evidence showed that in a way they were law-abiding people. They wanted to keep on the right side of the line. Now, he (Mr. Elton) thought they would catch them by making their profession illegal; for when they found that it was illegal they would come to the conclusion that "discretion was the better part of valour," and retire from their business. As to the rest—the sterner and more abandoned culprits—they might have to be punished once; but he still thought the Amendment would do much to put down this public nuisance. He would like to know how far these things that he was dealing with were illegal under the present law, if done openly, because he did not desire to introduce a new species of crime. He believed they were illegal at present; but he would qualify that opinion by saying that it was almost impossible to find any punishment that would apply to them. Conspiring to obtain people to commit illicit intercourse was, undoubtedly, a penal offence, so that they might, with great difficulty, succeed in catching these very unpleasant people when they went about in groups, or hunted in couples. If, however, these kidnappers went about single-handed, it was very difficult to catch them. Taking a child away from home was an offence also against the peace of the Realm, according to a decision in the time of Henry VII.; but, probably, the offences were punishable in the Ecclesiastical Courts, the jurisdiction of which was now obsolete and was never well-defined. With regard to the expression "persistent persuasion," which, no doubt, some hon. Gentlemen would speak about, all he could say was that there was no doubt, from Howell's case, that although it might not be an offence which was punishable by their Statutes it was unquestionably unlawful, and that was why he had put the words into the Amendment. The warm and over-excited speech they had heard from the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) was exceedingly interesting; but he (Mr. Elton) would point out that they had heard the same thing with regard to every amendment of the Criminal Law for many years past, and, notwithstanding the hon. and learned Gentleman's remarks, he hoped the Committee would support his Motion. The Amendment which he felt it his duty to move was based on the Reports of various important Inquiries which had sat before any statements on this subject were published in *The Pall Mall Gazette*. He begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, after line 9, insert the following sub-section:—"(1) Procures, or by persistent persuasion or other importunity, or by offer or holding out of reward or hope of reward, endeavours to procure any woman or girl, not being a common prostitute, to have unlawful connexion, either within or without the Queen's dominions, with any other person or persons; or."—(*Mr. Elton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, the clause was one directed against the offence of procuring. He took it that the object of the Amendment of his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Elton) was to prevent anyone procuring or endeavouring to procure, under the circumstances he had specified, any woman or girl to become a common prostitute. He, therefore, intended to support the Amendment, which sought to prevent a girl taking the first step towards an immoral life.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, he did not wish to be considered a critic of the Bill or of any Amendment which would strengthen it; but he thought the Committee would agree with him that they must be very careful in what they did. The Committee must look at the effect of this Amendment. They would observe that there was no limit as to age whatever, and that the Amendment was so drawn that any person who carried a message from a woman to a woman might be liable to two years' imprisonment. Let him put another case in which the Amendment would apply. Suppose a man married abroad his deceased wife's sister. Any cohabitation between them in this country would be an unlawful connection. He had known a woman in such a position consult a professional man as to whether she should remain in the man's house. The advice given was that, under the circumstances, she should. It might be contended that the person who gave such advice would be liable to two years' imprisonment, if this Amendment became law. Now, there was an Amendment standing on the next page, in the name of his hon. Friend the Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Stuart), which, if it could be discussed and slightly altered, would get rid of the objection he (Sir Henry James) had pointed out. The hon. Gentleman's (Mr. J. Stuart's) Amendment was to insert—

> "Procures, or endeavours to procure, any girl under the age of twenty-one years, not being a common prostitute, to have unlawful carnal intercourse with any other person, either within or without the Queen's dominions."

If they could adopt some such proposition, they would avoid the difficulty of a definition, which they must have, of "persistent persuasion or other importunity."

Mr. HOPWOOD asked what was meant by "endeavours to procure?" The law did not know "an endeavour;" but it did know "an attempt," and an attempt to commit a crime was punishable. If they adopted the word "attempt," the term would be thoroughly understood. How were they going to define "endeavour?" He earnestly asked the repositories of legal science in the House to protect them against this sort of legislation.

Mr. GREGORY said, that this was a highly penal clause, and, therefore, the Committee should be very careful what they did. It appeared to him the clause itself, as well as this particular Amendment, required the most grave consideration. It was quite clear that the Amendment, if not the clause, involved the greatest difficulty of judicial construction. Those who had to deal with cases under the clause would have to consider what was the meaning of "procuring," what was the meaning of "persistent persuasion," and what was the meaning of "other importunity," and what was the meaning of "by offer or holding out of reward or hope of reward." There was no doubt there would be conflicting opinions as to the meaning of all these phrases; and in the case of a law of this kind it was most essential to avoid conflicting decisions. He confessed he disliked the words "procures or endeavours to procure." The clause might be open to the construction that the very seduction of a woman led her into prostitution. The Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Stuart) undoubtedly mitigated to some extent the severity of the clause, because it confined the operation of the clause to cases of women under 21 years of age. To apply the clause to women of all ages was simply ridiculous. But even the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Hackney would require very serious attention when it came before the Committee. He hoped the present Amendment would be withdrawn with a view to the consideration of that hon. Member's Amendment, which he (Mr. Gregory) considered much preferable to the subsection under notice as it stood.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, he thought it would be very convenient to discuss the Amendments of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for West Somerset (Mr. Elton) and of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Stuart) together. He would like to remind the right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Attorney General (Sir Henry James) and the Committee generally of what the object of both these Amendments was. The object was to prevent any attempts to get a woman or girl to have unlawful connection with any other person. The Amendments were aimed at the horrible and ghastly trade of procuring, and had nothing to do with any vice between man and woman. That being so, let them consider for a moment whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Attorney General was right in the view he took of the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for West Somerset (Mr. Elton). He (the Attorney General) ventured to think the right hon. and learned Gentleman was not right in the view he took. The hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Stuart) proposed the adoption of the words "procures or endeavours to procure." There was no limit to the endeavouring to procure. [Sir HENRY JAMES: Twenty-one years of age.] He quite admitted the question of age was one the Committee should consider; but he was, for the moment, dealing with the governing words "procures or endeavours to procure." He wished to keep that point distinct from the question of age. It was said, and, no doubt, said very truly, that there might be some such case as the right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Attorney General put—a case of a man marrying his deceased wife's sister, and some sort of persuasion being used. That, however, was a very uncommon case. It was not an exceptional case for a man to marry his deceased wife's sister; but it was very exceptional for there to be persistent persuasion or importunity of some other person to get the man and woman to marry. He did not say that the right hon. and learned Gentleman might not be right in using the case as an argument for limiting the age to which the clause should apply; but he did not think it was a case to be used as an argument in dealing with the other parts of the clause—namely, "persistent persuasion or other importunity." The hon. Gentleman the Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory) had complained of the elasticity of the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for West Somerset. He had said the words of the Amendment would necessitate legal construction; of course they would, and with regard to their meaning there might be differences of opinion. The elasticity of the Amendment was just what was wanted. It must be a question of fact, it must be a question for the jury under the direction of the Judge; but he thought it was desirable to adopt some words which would make it clear to the tribunal that what was intended to be aimed at was the persistent endeavour to get a woman or girl to have illicit connection with some man. He, therefore, asked whether it would not be prudent to insert in the clause some such words as the hon. and learned Member for West Somerset suggested? In any case, he hoped the spirit of the Amendment would be adopted, so that the clause might really point at the evil they desired to cope with. He had no particular view on the question of age; that was a question which had better be raised by those who had more experience on the subject than he himself had.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, there seemed to be little or no difference in the Committee as to the object of this Amendment—namely, that it was to prevent the trade of procuring. But he confessed it was rather dangerous to go into details as to the method of procuring, as they would do if they adopted the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Elton). It appeared to him (Sir William Harcourt) that the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Stuart) raised the question in what might be called the neatest form, though he agreed with the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Hopwood) that they should say "attempts" instead of "endeavours." The clause would then read—"Procures or attempts to procure any girl, not being a common prostitute;" and then he should like to put in the words which had been suggested by an hon. Gentleman opposite, "or of known immoral character," for the clause was clearly not meant to apply to a woman who had been in the keeping of one man and then passed into the keeping of another man. He thought that if they took the Amendment of the hon. Member for Hackney as a basis, and altered it in the way he had suggested, they would come to a satisfactory conclusion.

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, he entirely sympathized with the view taken by the hon. and learned Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster), as to the meaning of the clause. As the hon. and learned Gentleman stated, the object of the clause was to strike a blow at the trade of the procurer or procuress. He believed the whole of the Committee were agreed as to that object; but it appeared to him that this clause, while having that very laudable and desirable object, really lost that object in one point of view and went far beyond it in another point of view. His hon. and learned Friend the Member for West Somerset (Mr. Elton) ought to have moved his Amendment on Clause 3. Clause 2 was directed at a different class of offences, and Clause 2 was that clause which dealt with the trade of procuring. If they adopted this Amendment on this clause, the effect of Clause 3 would be weakened. That, however, was a mere objection of form, and one which could easily be got over. But he should like to ask the hon. and learned Member for West Somerset what he meant by "any other person or persons?" Did he mean any person or persons other than the procurer; or, did he mean any other person or persons other than the girl or woman? [Mr. Elton: Other than the procurer.] Then that would lead to a remarkable state of things. A man might seduce a girl and yet not be liable to punishment; but if he assisted a friend to seduce the girl, and persuaded the girl to submit herself to his friend's desire, he would be liable to two years' imprisonment. It seemed to him that in the desire of the Committee, in which he absolutely and entirely shared, to put down the trade of the procurer, there was a danger of introducing into the Bill the most illogical and absurd anomalies.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, it was expressly intended that this Amendment should not deal with the offence of seduction; that offence was dealt with in another part of the Bill. This Amendment was only intended to deal with procuring for other people.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON said, he wished to point out to the Mover of the Amendment (Mr. Elton) that the word "procures" covered the words "by persistent persuasion or other importunity, or by offer or holding out of reward or hope of reward." These words, therefore, were quite unnecessary. "Procures or attempts to procure," would, no doubt, be better, and would meet the whole case.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he wished to direct the attention of the hon. and learned Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) to a point which appeared to have escaped consideration. The Amendment, as well as the Bill itself, referred to offences which were to be committed within or without the Queen's Dominions. He would like to ask whether, in case a foreigner, who procured a foreigner in a foreign country without the intervention of a British subject came to this country, he would be chargeable with misdemeanour? This Bill was very carelessly drawn; he did not suppose that a more carelessly drawn Bill was ever presented to a Committee for consideration. He had heard that one of the causes was that the Bill was interfered with by the Bishops in the other House. Now, if it were the fact that a foreigner, procuring a woman or girl abroad, would be liable, on coming to this country, to be imprisoned for two years with hard labour, he (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) could foresee that there might be intervention by Foreign Governments, and that a great deal of inconvenience might result. He would be glad if the Law Officers of the Crown would afford the Committee some explanation upon this point, and consent to introduce words which would relieve any ambiguity on the subject. Having said so much on the question, he wished to ask his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General whether he would introduce here a limitation as to age, as suggested by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James) and by the hon. Gentleman the Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory), because, if he did not, there would be a vast amount of difficulty?

Sir BALDWYN LEIGHTON said, he trusted that, after the opinions which had been expressed, there would be no difficulty in settling this sub-section. He appealed to the hon. and learned Member for West Somerset (Mr. Elton) to adopt the words suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), and which were perfectly clear.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, there was a reason for adhering to the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for West Somerset (Mr. Elton). He quite agreed that "attempts" would be a better word than "endeavours;" but it seemed to those who supported the Amendment that they ought to indicate the class of attempts they desired to make an offence. He should also be willing to adopt 21 years as the limit of age, and also the words "or of immoral character."

Mr. WARTON said, it was perfectly clear, from the little discussion they had had, that there was great difference of opinion on this point amongst the eminent lawyers of the House. Some were in favour of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Stuart), and others in favour of the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for

West Somerset (Mr. Elton); opinion seemed to sway backwards between the two Amendments. He was astonished the hon. and learned Member for West Somerset had adopted the word "endeavours," because the word was not known to the English law. He was still more astonished that it should be proposed to accept the words "or of known immoral character." The word "known" might be taken in the sense of being known to the person who committed the offence, and the criminal might therefore escape. Although he objected strongly to the Bill, he thought it was his duty, when the clauses came up for consideration, to make them as perfect for their object as possible. Some hon. Members seemed to be under the impression that the words "by persistent persuasion or other importunity" made the sub-section more vigorous. He was inclined to think that they were words of limitation. [The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster): No.] He was sory to differ from the hon. and learned Gentleman; but he had compared the Amendment with that of the hon. Member for Hackney, and he was inclined to think that though the words looked grand, they were words of limitation, tending to weaken instead of to strengthen the clause.

The Secretary of State (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he hoped the Committee would not waste time by proposing verbal Amendments to the Amendment before the Committee. He would propose to leave out "endeavours" and insert "attempt," and also to insert after the words "woman or girl" the words "under twenty-one years of age."

Mr. COURTNEY said, he had been struck with the observations of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), which had been corroborated by the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton), with regard to the inconvenience of putting the clause into the Bill. It was only too probable that these words would give rise to much discussion between Judges and juries. He would, therefore, propose to amend the Amendment by leaving out all the words from "by persistent persuasion" down to "reward."

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment,

To leave out the words "by persistent persuasion or other importunity, or by offer or holding out of reward or hope of reward, endeavours," in order to insert the word "attempts."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the said proposed Amendment."

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he had listened to the observations of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Assheton Cross), and he thought that the Committee ought to adopt the Amendment of the sub-section which he had proposed to move. Although he (Sir William Harcourt) had pointed out an objection to the words of the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. Elton), he thought if they were to go on with the Bill they ought not to continue to propose verbal Amendments like this to that Amendment.

Mr. EDWARD CLARKE said, he wished to point out that this was not a question of verbally amending the sub-section; it was a question of very substantial importance. It was a question of the expediency of narrowing the operation of the Bill, which would be the effect of allowing these ill-advised words to remain within the Amendment. The effect of these words, which were new to lawyers, had been pointed out—namely, that they would cause difficulty of interpretation. He did not believe in the filthy fables of *The Pall Mall Gazette;* but he and his hon. Friends desired, if the Bill was to operate at all, that it should operate on all the forms of vice which could be interfered with. Hon. Members would observe that it was proposed to repeal the 49th section of 24 & 25 *Vict.* c. 100. He did not believe that the procuration of young girls was done in the way indicated by the Amendment—that was to say, by habitual importunity upon them. Probably, the most usual way was when a young girl was met at a railway station by a woman who told her that she—the woman—kept a lodging house; and the girl by mere false pretences found herself in some place of vicious resort. If the Committee adopted the clause and did not strike out the words relating to the 49th section of 24 & 25 *Vict.*, they would leave that offence unprovided for. The Act provided that—"Whosoever shall by means of false pretences, &c., &c., shall be guilty of misdemeanour." He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt) that this clause would be most effective, if it contained the words "procured or attempts to procure;" and inasmuch as no one objected to those words, he hoped the Committee would agree that this was not a matter of triviality, but of importance.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, Her Majesty Government were willing to take the larger view of the question, and strike out the words proposed to be omitted by the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney).

MR. STANSFELD said, there would be some difficulty in using the word "endeavours" instead of "attempts." The hon. and learned Member (Mr. Elton) could not, he believed, use the word "endeavours," because it was not in the Bill.

SIR FARRER HERSCHELL said, he wished to point out that the hon. and learned Member for Plymouth (Mr. E. Clarke) was mistaken in supposing that the Bill left the offence of using false pretences undealt with.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the word 'attempt' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, to add, after the word "girl," the words "under twenty-one years of age."—(*Sir Henry James.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. WARTON said, he objected to the word "girl."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, in that case, the only thing to be done would be to put in the word "female" instead.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he objected to the word "female." It was much better to keep to the old phraseology, and let the word "girl" remain.

MR. TOMLINSON said, that the clause, as amended, was not free from ambiguity. It might be questioned whether the restriction of the age referred to "woman" or to "girl" only.

Question put, and *agreed to; words added* accordingly.

Said proposed Amendment further amended by inserting, after the word "prostitute," the words "or of immoral character."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Amendment, as amended, stand part of the Clause."

MR. WARTON said, the words "immoral character" only tended to weaken the clause, and he should move to substitute the words "known immoral character."

Amendment proposed to said proposed Amendment, after the word "of," to insert "known."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Amendment *negatived.*

Question again proposed, "That the Amendment, as amended, stand part of the Clause."

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he wished to know whether the words "unlawful connection" were to stand part of the sub-section? They were of doubtful meaning, and the act had been described differently under various Acts of Parliament. He suggested that the expression used in the Amendment should be made to agree either with the Bill or with previous Acts of Parliament.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he had no objection; but the two expressions seemed to him to be the same in effect.

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, they did not, in that part of the House, hear all that was said on the Treasury Bench. He had understood the Home Secretary to move the words "or of known immoral character." He was at a loss to see how they could adopt those words in the Act. Who could say that a person was a known immoral character? Some modification of the phrase ought, in his opinion, to be made; and he hoped his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General, who took so much interest in the Bill, would give his attention to the point before the Report stage came on. The expression might be popular, but it was not legal.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK, in moving, as an Amendment, in page 1, line 10, leave out "procures or," said, before the Committee of which he had the honour of being a Member, and which sat to take into consideration the

Contagious Diseases Acts, three witnesses were introduced to prove that there was no definition of the term "common prostitute." Those witnesses were men of great learning; and the Committee were told, over and over again, that the term "common prostitute" was not to be found in any Act of Parliament that they had been able to discover. One witness said that a common prostitute was a woman who was known to go about the streets, earning money in a certain way. Under the circumstances, he would do everything to prevent procuration; but unless they knew what common prostitution was, it seemed to him they were introducing into the Act what was absolute nonsense. How could a person procure anyone, whether woman or girl, to do these separate acts — it would be necessary to follow her about, day after day, inducing her to follow this avocation? He would point out the great carelessness which had been exhibited by the framers of the Act in leaving it undecided what a prostitute was; and he would ask whether it was not possible settle this matter for good and all, so that when the discussion progressed, they might know what a prostitute was? It was not his intention to divide the Committee, although he looked on this part of the Bill as pure nonsense. Was it the intention of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary to define what was a common prostitute?

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 10, to leave out "procures or."—(*Mr. Cavendish Bentinck.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. THOROLD ROGERS said, he wished to know what was the Question before the Committee?

The CHAIRMAN: The Question before the Committee is to omit Sub-section 1 of Clause 2—or all but the three first words. It is to omit, after the word "endeavours," in line 10, all the words down to the word "to," in line 13. The Question, however, has been put in such a way as to enable the hon. Member to move his Amendment.

Captain PRICE said, it would save a great deal of time if they were to leave out this sub-section altogether. It was already punishable for anyone to procure a woman to have unlawful connection; they went further, and said it was unlawful for a woman to be a common prostitute. Surely what had been already done included this sub-section.

Mr. THOROLD ROGERS said, he had an Amendment of no insignificance to propose to this clause, which would come in after line 12; and he wished to have the ruling of the Chairman whether, if the present Amendment were put, his Amendment would be excluded from consideration?

The CHAIRMAN: I have said that I will so put the Question as to enable the hon. Member to propose his Amendment. His competence to move the Amendment depends upon the manner in which the Question is put. It is proposed to leave out all the words after the word "endeavours," in line 10, to the word "to," in line 13. The Question is, that the words "procures or" stand part of the Clause.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he had a right to ask Her Majesty's Government whether it was their intention to define the term "common prostitute," and in common courtesy he was entitled to a reply. [*Cries of* "Divide!"] Hon. Gentlemen would perhaps allow him to ask a question. He had pointed out why the term, as it at present stood, was objectionable. Unless something was done in the directiou he had indicated, the magistrates before whom these people might be brought would have a difficulty in deciding who was a common prostitute and who was not. He asked the Government to settle the point for ever in the Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster): No words are needed to define the term "common prostitute."

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, there was an Amendment on the Paper to insert, in line 10, after the word "girl," the words "under the age of twenty-one years." He presumed the Government accepted it?

The CHAIRMAN: Whose name is it in?

Mr. LABOUCHERE: In that of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck). I would, however, move it myself if the right hon. and learned Gentleman does not.

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 10, after the word "girl," to insert the words "under the age of twenty-one years."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he hoped these words would not be inserted. The object of the clause was to prevent a trade in prostitution within or without the Queen's Dominions. The clause, therefore, ought to be universal, applying to females over as well as under the age of 21 years. He hoped no indication would be shown in the clause of a desire to restrict its operation.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, these words had been inserted in the sub-section previously dealing with the trade in prostitution. This was just the same thing. ["No, no!"] Well, that was his opinion, and it was open to hon. Members to go to a division on the matter. The object of the Bill was to protect young girls—all the outcry had been for that, as the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary knew perfectly well; and to say that they would punish any person who procured or endeavoured to procure a woman of 30, 40, 50, or goodness knew what age, to become either within or without the Queen's Dominions a common prostitute, appeared to him to be perfectly absurd. He must press the Amendment.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 2; Noes 223: Majority 221.—(Div. List, No. 257.)

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he had another Amendment to move to the sub-section, and whether or not the Committee would agree to it he did not know. The object of the following sub-section was to punish anyone who procured

> "Or endeavoured to procure a woman or girl to leave the United Kingdom, or to leave her usual place of abode in the United Kingdom, with intent that she might become an inmate of a brothel either within or without the Queen's dominions".

The object of his Amendments—and one was consequential on the other—was to provide for the punishment of any person procuring or endeavouring to procure a girl under or over the age of 21 to be a common prostitute without the Queen's Dominions, but confining the punishment in regard to such procuration within the Queen's Dominions to cases where the girl was under the age of 21. The reason he wished to draw the distinction was that, in English brothels, it was obvious that women above 21 would be able to get out if they desired, and unless they were imprisoned, in which case the Common Law would deal with the persons detaining them. Abroad, as they were aware, it often happened that women were not able to get out, however much they might have passed the age of 21. The residence of girls and women in foreign brothels was something very like imprisonment. These unfortunate women did not know what was about to happen to them when they went into foreign brothels. It was very proper to give this protection to women and girls who might be taken abroad and put into foreign brothels; but he could not think it was necessary to give it in the case of girls in English brothels. He begged to move the omission of the words "either within or."

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 11, to leave out "either within or." —(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, the hon. Gentleman's object was to make a distinction between the operation of the clause in cases occurring within Her Majesty's Dominions, and cases occurring without those Dominions. The hon. Gentleman wished to limit the operation of the clause in cases occurring within Her Majesty's Dominions to procuration affecting girls of under 21 years of age. Well, the Committee had already decided the point against the hon. Member, having refused to limit the action of the clause in cases occurring within the Queen's Dominions to girls under the age of 21.

MR. LABOUCHERE: The right hon. Gentleman is quite correct. I understood we had reached the Amendment on the next page.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Gentleman withdraw the Amendment?

MR. LABOUCHERE: I do.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. Serjeant SIMON said, he had given Notice of an Amendment to make the sub-section apply to cases of procuring a woman or girl to have "unlawful connexion with any particular man or generally;" but he did not now propose to move it, as the cases could be met by words in the Home Secretary's clauses.

Mr. THOROLD ROGERS said, that, in accordance with a Notice he had placed on the Paper, he wished to move the insertion of the following sub-section:—

> "(2.) While carrying on an otherwise lawful business, knowingly facilitates, in premises of which he is the occupier, an immoral connexion between such women as reside there, and are in his employ, and male visitors to them, or."

This Amendment was intended to deal with an entirely new kind of offence—an offence which, he believed, was not already provided against by the existing law. Upon that, of course, he might be ill-informed; and if that should be the case, he was entirely prepared to be set right. He might say that if there had been any Act of Parliament which was intended to extend — quite apart from the present excitement on the subject, and quite apart from any real or reputed revelations which had been made —or increase the penalty of the law against offenders who were, generally, covered by this Bill, such as were indicated by his clause, he should not have brought forward this proposal. He had it on very credible authority that houses of the kind referred to in his Amendment really existed; houses in which, downstairs, businesses of a lawful and legitimate kind were carried on, such as milliners, drapers, and fancy dealers, and the windows of which displayed a variety of goods, whilst the upstairs rooms were let to single occupants, those occupants being informed or instructed, or having it hinted to them, that they had private use of the apartment with a private key, and that, under the circumstances, they could admit their male friends or whom they pleased, without any questions being asked. He was informed that this kind of practice was carried on very extensively; and if that were so, it seemed to him that it ought to be met by the strongest action of the law. It was the worst kind of brothel life he could conceive. If, on the other hand, the report was untrue, he admitted that the clause was mere *brutum fulmen.* He heard the other day—a friend of his had told him —[*Laughter.*]—he saw the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary laughing; he was afraid the right hon. Gentleman was not fully aware of the depth of the depravity of human nature, notwithstanding his experience in the Home Office, which was a great place for becoming familiar with it—but, as he was saying, a friend of his, a Member of the House of Commons, had told him that a short time ago one of his constituents had related this circumstance to him. A relation of his—a niece or cousin—[*Laughter.*]—he did not see any ground for laughter here—the incident seemed to him a very tragic one. This niece or cousin answered an advertisement in a newspaper, under which she was invited to become a milliner at the wages of the house—a house engaged in supplying people of station and not persons of a humble class with clothing. She came to the establishment, having been apprenticed to the millinery business. She inquired what the wages would be, and was told "so much." She replied that she could not live on the sum named, whereupon the person addressing her said—"You do not understand the business; you will have a room to yourself; no one will ask questions as to when you come in or when you go out." He ventured to say that this incident was true. It was told to him by a gentleman who had easily detected what this arrangement was—who saw at once the meaning of the statement "and no questions will be asked." It was a temptation, perhaps worse than a temptation, that was involved, and, that being the case, the house in question was the worst kind of brothel that could be conceived. If such a state of things did exist, it was the duty of the Committee, and of everybody who wished to protect young persons from the risk of being debauched by fraud or violence, to accept some such proposal as that contained in his clause. He did not mean to say that he had framed the clause in such legal language that no right hon. or hon. Gentleman on either side of the House could find fault with it. He knew little about that, and cared little or nothing about it; but the Amendment appeared to him an averment of what was necessary to protect young people under or over the age of 21, and he was bound to say that it ought to be taken seriously. If these words were objected to, the subject ought to be dealt with as those hon. Gentlemen learned in the law knew how to deal with it. He was only concerned in the vindication of what appeared to him to be a great principle—namely, the prevention of what he believed to be a very great wrong. He knew that clauses of this kind were constantly said to be unworkable; but he contended that it was the duty of the Government, particularly of the Law Officers of the Crown, in case the Committee decided to accept the principle, to discover for them the words in which the Amendment could be framed. With these words, and stating that he did really believe that in this new sub-section he had fixed upon a genuine grievance, a wrong and a mischief which ought to be remedied, he put the Amendment in the hands of the Committee.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, after line 12, to insert the words—"(2.) While carrying on an otherwise lawful business, knowingly facilitates, in premises of which he is the occupier, an immoral connexion between such women as reside there, and are in his employ, and male visitors to them, or."—(*Mr. Thorold Rogers.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he must oppose the Amendment, because he thought it was not desirable that they should encumber this Bill by endeavouring to deal with every conceivable case. He did not think it was impossible at all that such a case as his hon. Friend (Mr. Thorold Rogers) had suggested might occur; but there were many hundreds of other cases which might occur, and by which illicit connection might be brought about. Now, it appeared to him that such a place as that described by the hon. Member was either a brothel or it was not; and if it was a place where women prostituted themselves as part of the business, it would come under the Bill. It was not desirable that they should endeavour to meet every case.

MR. PICTON said, he hoped the Committee would reflect before they rejected this Amendment. A situation was offered to a young woman in an apparently respectable house of business. She was offered a low salary, and then she was induced to prostitute herself, in order to increase her earnings. That was a very wrong and wicked state of things. The offer of the situation was used to induce young women to go to places of this sort in order to debauch them. He would certainly vote for the Amendment.

SIR FARRER HERSCHELL said, the case which had been mentioned by his hon. Friend the Member for Leicester would come under the sub-section which they had already passed. In the case of a man inducing a young woman to accept a situation in order that she might have illicit connection, that would come under the 1st sub-section. He did not quite see what cases would be met by this sort of provision which it was proposed to insert in the Bill. If a man did not procure, then there was no necessity for dealing with him; and, if he did, they had hit him already.

MR. THOROLD ROGERS said, he would not withdraw his Amendment. He would certainly take a division upon it.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 52; Noes 152: Majority 100.—(Div. List, No. 258.)

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK, in moving, as an Amendment, in page 1, line 13, after "girl," insert "under the age of twenty-one years," said, that on the Question of the Speaker leaving the Chair on the Bill he had endeavoured to express to the House his strong desire to do everything that could be done to protect women and children from crimes of this sort; but, at the same time, he expressed his fear that many of the provisions of the Bill might lead to extortion, and interfere with the public safety. He knew of no portion of the Bill which was more calculated to do that than this sub-section. His Amendment was aimed at that fact, and it proposed to limit the misdemeanour of inducing women to live in ill-conducted houses to the case of girls under 21 years of age. The hon. and learned Member for Colchester (Mr. Willis) had illustrated his point very well the other day when he put the case of a man bringing a lady of 35 years of age to London from the country, and staying at one of those houses where there was a good deal of freedom. Under the clause as it stood, that man would be guilty of misdemeanour. It appeared to him that, unless some Amendment was effected, men might be induced to go with women into houses of ill-fame, and then a threat might be made that, if they did not pay a sum of money, a criminal prosecution would be instituted against them under this clause. He wished to point out also that, at the present time, there was no precise definition in the Bill of the word "brothel." Unless that term was defined, and unless the clause was limited as he had suggested, it would open the door to unlimited extortion upon the youth of this country. It often occurred that the youth of this country was lured into these sort of places; and now a threat would be held out that, unless a certain amount of money was paid, a charge of misdemeanour might be brought. He would like the hon. and learned Attorney General to tell the Committee what was "a brothel within the Queen's Dominions." They knew that in France and Italy all the houses of this sort were licensed by the authorities, and no one could come into them without the knowledge of the authorities. What he wanted to know was whether this term abroad was to be accepted according to the foreign definition, or according to an English definition, whatever that might be? He wanted to know what sort of a house they had in view? If they took the foreign acceptation, then there would not be much harm done; but if they were going to deal with houses like that referred to by the hon. and learned Member for Colchester (Mr. Willis), then it became a very serious matter. ["Divide!"] Did hon. Members wish to stifle this question? They wanted to stifle it because they could not answer it; and they were afraid of meeting any responsibility. He had been a Member of that House for a great many years, and he had always taken an independent course, and he was going to continue to take an independent course to the end of his chapter. He was doing his duty to his constituents, and he was not to be put down by this clamour. He wished to place these points very calmly before hon. Members, and there was no doubt that, if this Amendment were accepted, it would meet the case he had set forth. What he wished to show was, that this clause, as it stood, would render liable many in this country and also abroad to extortion; and unless the term "brothel" was very clearly defined, therefore, great ambiguity would arise and consequent danger. While on this subject he wished to point out to the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary line 17, which would hardly make sense. The whole sub-section was governed by the word "person;" and unless some definition were put in, and the person happened to be a woman and a procuress, she would escape unpunished. He thought he had shown that, unless the clause was very much changed, it would lead to very great extortion against Her Majesty's subjects.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 13, after "girl," insert "under the age of twenty-one."—(*Mr. Cavendish Bentinck.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, there could be no doubt that the word "brothel" had a meaning according to the English law. There was no difference between "brothel" and "bawdy house," and the term occurred in many legal documents.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK asked if the sub-section applied to foreigners? The effect of the clause could only be shown by *reductio ad absurdum.* The hon. and learned Attorney General had said that the meaning of the word "brothel" was understood in law—that was to say, as it was understood in England. But that was no definition at all. As the clause stood, it would mean that if a foreigner induced another foreigner to enter a house abroad which in England was called a brothel, the foreigner who induced the other to enter the house was to be punished if he or she came to England.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) appeared to forget that the question had been twice answered. The words "Either within or without the Queen's Dominions" referred to the place where the brothel might be.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Mr. ACKERS said, he had not proposed to move the Amendment he was about to submit to the Committee, in relation to the first sub-section, because it would not be applicable; with regard to a person contemplated by that part of the clause who had become a prostitute there could be no such reservation as that proposed by the Amendment he was about to move to sub-section 2. With regard to that, he thought the Amendment most important, and he trusted that it would be inserted. He reserved to himself the right of raising the question with regard to the Amendment which had been agreed to of the hon. and learned Member for West Somersetshire (Mr. Elton), if it should be shown by the discussion which followed that the words he proposed to introduce into this sub-section were applicable to the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 13, after "girl," insert "other than a common prostitute, or person of known immoral character."—(*Mr. Ackers.*)

Question proposed "That those words be there inserted."

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he would point out that the object of the clause was not only to prevent women being induced to become prostitutes, but to prevent the trade in prostitution being carried on as between this country and foreign countries. The character of the woman ought, therefore, to make no difference.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, he was not surprised that the right hon. Gentleman the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt) wanted to get rid of this traffic, and he (Mr. Hopwood) would point out that this sub-section was one of the most laudable parts of the Bill. But, as had been suggested, if a man removed a woman already a common prostitute from one house to another, even for the sake of continuing her calling, but possibly as an act of charity, according to the clause he might come within the law, because he did so within the Queen's Dominions. If his right hon. Friend wanted merely to interfere with the traffic in question, the meaning of the clause would be clear enough; but with regard to England, he (Mr. Hopwood) thought some sensible Amendment was required in accordance with the view expressed in the previous sub-section.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, that the Government were prepared to accept an Amendment which the hon. and learned Member for Stockport was about to move, to add the words "for this purpose of prostitution." He was surprised that the hon. and learned Gentleman, who was a lawyer, did not see that the words "with intent, &c." governed the case he had suggested. If they were going to deal with this particular evil he did not think they ought in any way to limit the operation of the clause by the insertion of such words as the hon. Member for West Gloucestershire (Mr. Ackers) had proposed. He submitted that the Committee should not agree to that Amendment.

An hon. Member said, that the object of the Bill was to protect women and girls, and not, as the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir William Harcourt) had said, to prevent the transfer of women from one place to another.

Mr. T. C. THOMPSON said, there were many women who, having been common prostitutes, were induced by clergymen and other philanthropic persons to enter reformatories. It was known that immediately they left those reformatories they were exposed to the attempts of those with whom they had formerly been associated to get them to return to their former courses. He (Mr. T. C. Thompson) said there was no class of women around whom the protection of the Bill ought to be thrown more than the class he had referred to. He asked the Committee to protect them by saying that those who sought to get them to return to their former mode of life should be punished under the clause.

Captain PRICE said, he would put the case of a woman or girl moved from one place in London to another out of charity, in which case he would point out that the person who induced her to go would be liable as the clause stood at present.

Mr. COURTNEY said, it appeared to him that if this sub-section was allowed to remain without qualification they would be placed in an awkward position. The hon. and gallant Member for Devonport (Captain Price) had put the case of a woman removed from one place in London to another, perhaps from motives of charity. This was not a case of deception; it was not a case of inducing a woman or girl to enter a brothel for the first time; yet it was an offence if the clause remained unaltered. It was the case of a person being taken from one brothel to another by solicitation, which was intended to be met; yet he would ask if any one would suppose that the offence would be punished in the manner provided for in the Bill?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he proposed to alter the language so as to make the matter clear.

MR. JAMES STUART said, he hoped these words would not be applied to women when removed to foreign places. The horrible character of compulsory detention in a foreign brothel was as much worse than that in the case of an ordinary brothel, as prostitution was than ordinary life.

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, he did not think that the proposal of the hon. and learned Attorney General would meet the point raised by the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Stuart). He agreed with the hon. Gentleman, that it was desirable to protect females in the circumstances mentioned.

THE CHAIRMAN: We have not come to that yet.

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, he thought he was in Order. The Question before the Committee was, that the words proposed by the hon. Member for West Gloucestershire (Mr. Ackers) be inserted, and he had understood the hon. and learned Attorney General to propose to leave out certain words and substitute others later on. He was endeavouring to show——

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. and learned Member can show that when he comes to the part of the Bill proposed to be altered by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General.

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, with great submission, he thought that the Chairman had not heard what he had to say. He was endeavouring to show why the Committee ought not, in his opinion, to accept the words proposed by the hon. Member for West Gloucestershire. He did not agree with the construction placed upon the clause, that it would apply to taking away a woman from one brothel to another. The words "with intent that she may become an inmate of a brothel" implied for the purpose of prostitution for the first time; and he did not think they were open to the construction placed upon them, and for which the Amendment of the hon. Member for West Gloucestershire was supposed to provide a cure.

MR. ACKERS said, he wished to make a practical suggestion with regard to this matter. He did not feel able to accept, as he understood it, the proposal of the hon. and learned Attorney General; because he gathered that it would limit the application of the clause to cases where the removal was from a place that was not a brothel to a place that was a brothel. So far as the effect abroad was concerned, he was quite willing to withdraw his Amendment; but he hoped it would be accepted in respect of England, and that it would be accepted in full, because he did not think it was a crime, although it was immoral, for one inmate of a brothel to say to another—"You had better leave here and go to another place." Therefore, he hoped the hon. and learned Attorney General would be able to accept his Amendment so far as it applied to England, in which case he would be happy to withdraw it, and leave the wording of it to the hon. and learned Gentleman.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he would point out, with reference to the question raised by the hon. Member, that the wording of the clause was—

> "Procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to leave the United Kingdom or to leave her usual place of abode in the United Kingdom."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he thought the proposed Amendment of the hon. and learned Attorney General was a right one. The only objection of any force to it was that the clause ought not to apply to the case of a woman going from one brothel to another.

MR. HORACE DAVEY rose to Order. He said that the Chairman had properly called him (Mr. Horace Davey) to Order when he proposed to discuss the words which the hon. and learned Attorney General said he would leave out. He presumed that the ruling which applied to one Member of the House would apply to another.

THE CHAIRMAN: The right hon. Gentleman (Sir William Harcourt) is not in Order in discussing the Amendment of the hon. and learned Attorney General.

MR. ACKERS said, he would leave the matter entirely in the hands of the hon. and learned Gentleman.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. LYULPH STANLEY said, they must break up the sub-section into two, and put in the first part—

> "Procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to leave the United Kingdom with the intent that she may become an inmate of a brothel either within or without the Queen's dominions,"

and in the second part—

> "Procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to leave the United Kingdom, or to leave her usual place of abode in the United Kingdom, such place not being a brothel, with intent that she may enter a brothel either within or without the Queen's dominions, whether or not he informs the woman or girl of such intent."

Otherwise they would not deal with the two separate cases of a girl, whatever her character, being kidnapped or enticed away, and a girl leaving her residence in one brothel for another brothel. The Amendment ought not to be put in its present form, otherwise it would prevent their giving effect to what appeared to be in the mind of the Committee.

CAPTAIN PRICE submitted that the point the hon. Member (Mr. Lyulph Stanley) wished to impress on the Committee had been dealt with in the previous part of the sub-section—

> "Procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to become, either within or without the Queen's dominions, a common prostitute."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he thought the following words would meet the difficulty:—

> "Procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to leave the United Kingdom with intent that she may become an inmate of a brothel without the Queen's dominions, or procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to leave the United Kingdom with intent that she may become an inmate of a brothel either within or without the Queen's dominions," &c.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he thought those words were quite unnecessary, and that the case would be properly put by the insertion of these words—

> "Procures or endeavours to procure any woman or girl to leave the United Kingdom, or to leave her usual place of abode in the United Kingdom, such place not being a brothel, with intent that she may become an inmate of a brothel either within or without the Queen's dominions," &c.

MR. SYDNEY BUXTON said, he would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill that he should prepare a clause embodying the wish of the Committee and bring it up on Report. The only difficulty seemed to be as to a verbal Amendment, and it was hopeless to arrive at a settlement when such a difficulty existed, and Amendments were suggested from all sides.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, they might insert after "place of abode in the United Kingdom" the words "such place not being a brothel," and then they could decide before the Report what other Amendments were necessary.

Amendment proposed,

> In page 1, line 15, after the words "United Kingdom," to insert the words "such place not being a brothel."—(*Secretary Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HOPWOOD said, they must take into consideration the case of a girl who was residing in her own private apartments, though just as much a prostitute as a girl in a brothel, and who might be induced by some familiar friend to give up her apartments for the purpose of living in a brothel.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): We will consider the matter before the Report.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he should have thought the best course would have been to have agreed to report Progress, so that the matter could have received the attention of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General during the night, and they could have started with a comprehensive proposal to-morrow.

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, he thought the Committee ought not to pass the Amendment. He felt certain, from what the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General had said just now, when he endeavoured to show how the clause would run, that, on careful consideration, he would see that the mere insertion of the words would not carry out his intention. As he (Mr. Horace Davey) understood the matter, two totally separate things were aimed at. One was to prevent the enticing of women or girls, whether of good or bad character—and, for his own part, he was desirous of protecting even women of bad character—to foreign brothels. The other thing it was desired to prevent was women or girls, who were not at present, at any rate, common prostitutes, from being enticed into becoming inmates of brothels. The Committee would at once see that there were two totally distinct things which it was sought to prevent. He was sure that if they endeavoured to prevent these two things by one common form of words, they would only get into error. He was sorry to have intervened just as the Chairman had been about to put the Question. His only desire was to see the wish of the Committee carried out; and he was sure the insertion of the words, after "United Kingdom," "such place not being a brothel," would not carry it out.

Sir FARRER HERSCHELL said, it would be a pity to report Progress on this question. No doubt the matter required consideration; but he did not think there should be much difficulty in arriving at a settlement. He thought the proposal made did carry out the intention of the Committee, as the two things would be most distinctly dealt with in the sub-section.

> "Procures or endeavours to procure any woman or girl to leave the United Kingdom . . . . with intent that she may become an inmate of a brothel either within or without the Queen's dominions,"

assuredly covered the case of a girl enticed from this country into a foreign brothel; and the words

> "To leave her usual place of abode in the United Kingdom with intent that she may become an inmate of a brothel"

quite as certainly covered the other case—namely, that of enticing a woman to enter a brothel. The insertion of the words "such place not being a brothel" would, no doubt, meet a great many of the objections which had been mentioned. There was the case the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) had put, and whether or not that should be dealt with was a matter for consideration. The best course would be to insert the words which would carry out the general views of the Committee.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, he agreed with the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Christchurch (Mr. Horace Davey) that a little alteration was required in the Amendment. What was required seemed to him the addition of very simple words in line 10. In the case of procuring a woman or girl to leave the United Kingdom, he did not think the words "either within or without the United Kingdom" should be used, and he would propose on Report to bring the clause up in an amended form. It might be well to say—

> "Procures or endeavours to procure any woman or girl to leave the United Kingdom with intent that she may become an inmate of a brothel without the Queen's dominions, whether or not he informs the girl of such intent."

Then, in another sub-section—

> "Procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to leave her usual place of abode in the United Kingdom, such place not being a brothel, with intent that she may become an inmate of a brothel either within or without the Queen's dominions, whether or not the woman or girl be informed of such intent."

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, he wished, as an Amendment, to move to leave out the words "an inmate," in line 15, and insert "a resident for the purposes of prostitution," so that the sub-section might read—

> "Procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to leave the United Kingdom, or to leave her usual place of abode in the United Kingdom, such place not being a brothel, with intent that she may become a resident for the purposes of prostitution of a brothel, either within or without the United Kingdom," &c.

If the Government would rather have the word "inmate," he would withdraw his Amendment; but he thought the words he proposed were better.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 15, leave out "an inmate," and insert "a resident for the purposes of prostitution."—(*Mr. Hopwood.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. LYULPH STANLEY said, it seemed to him clear that what the Committee wished to do was to punish a person for inducing a woman or girl to regularly take up her abode in a brothel for purposes of prostitution. A person might take a woman or girl to a brothel for one night, and that would technically render her "an inmate" under the section; but it was not meant to bring a person so acting under the penalties of the clause. To say that a person taking a woman or girl to a brothel for purposes of prostitution should be liable to two years' imprisonment seemed to him altogether ridiculous. The clause would apply not only to the procurer or procuress, but to the man who went to a brothel temporarily, as he might go to an hotel.

CAPTAIN PRICE said, he would point out that the clause would also apply to a person living in a brothel who engaged a female housemaid or cook.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he should like the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General to explain what legal construction he put on the word "inmate" as opposed to "resident."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, the word "resident" seemed to the Government too technical a word. He quite agreed, however, that the clause was not intended to apply to anyone taking a woman to a brothel temporarily as to an hotel. Though a casual visit of that kind would not constitute a woman "an inmate" of a brothel, yet a residence of a week or 10 days would do so. The reason why the word "resident" had been avoided was because there was a technical meaning given to it sometimes which they had thought it desirable to avoid. They had desired to hit the case of a woman going to a brothel and spending some time there, so as to become in the full sense an inmate.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH hoped the Committee would not accept the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood). It would defeat one very good effect that the clause would have in dealing with a well-known and common practice amongst brothel-keepers. One of the commonest devices for procuring prostitutes was the employment of girls in brothels as servants. They were often attracted as domestic servants, and then induced to lead immoral lives.

SIR BALDWYN LEIGHTON said, he would ask the Government not to alter the sub-section for the same reason. There was plenty of evidence that women were engaged in brothels as servants, and were afterwards trained up to be prostitutes. He would appeal to the Government not to omit the words which would protect this sort of women.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he quite appreciated the motives of hon. Gentlemen who had spoken; but he thought that if they allowed the clause to remain as it was, they would be providing legislation which would create difficulties—they would be falling into those pitfalls against which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) had cautioned them. They did not want to prevent these people from having cooks, and so on. They did not, by this clause, attempt to put down brothels; and if they adopted the advice of the last two hon. Members who had spoken, they would be giving the clause a wider scope than they desired.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

MR. HOPWOOD: I now beg to move, Sir, that you do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Hopwood.*)

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that the Committee were now agreed upon all the points in the clause, save that of age. There were several Amendments on the Paper to limit the operation of the clause, or part of it, to girls under the age of 21 years; and these, he thought, they could easily deal with.

Several hon. MEMBERS: Go on; go on!

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, the clause would require a considerable amount of amendment, because, in its present form, it would not deal with a female procuress.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) appealed to the Committee to make further progress with the Bill. There was no serious point in dispute now.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK: I beg pardon, there is.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 31; Noes 125: Majority 94.—(Div. List, No. 259.)

Clause 3 (Procuring defilement of woman by threats or fraud).

MR. HOPWOOD said, the first sub-section said—

> "Any person who by threats or intimidation procures or endeavours to procure any woman or girl . . . . . with himself or any other man," &c.

This, in point of law, was rape; and he wished to know what was the use of encumbering the Statute Book with alternative modes of stating that which was already the law? He had in several instances marked that tendency in the Bill, and he hoped hon. Members would allow him to call attention to it here. Attempts to commit the offence dealt with in the sub-section were also provided against in the present law. An attempt at rape was an offence at law; therefore it was no use passing this sub-section. He should very much like to know what reason there was for passing an Act of Parliament in this form, there being already in existence a well-known form of law, which was thoroughly comprehensible, to the same effect? He would move the omission of sub-section 1 of Clause 3.

Amendment proposed, in page 1, to leave out sub-section (1.)—(*Mr. Hopwood.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'By' stand part of the Clause."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he ventured to think that the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Hopwood) was not quite correct when he said that the clause was simply a repetition of the existing law. He did not mean to say that there might not be cases where threats amounted to rape under the existing law; but there certainly might be other cases where consent was obtained in that way without incurring the guilt of rape. There was another state of things which the sub-section dealt with; and he would ask hon. Members to pay strict attention to the words. The sub-section said—

> "Any person who—By threats or intimidation procures or endeavours to procure any woman or girl . . . . . either within or without the Queen's dominions with himself or any other man."

These words applied to cases which might occur without the Queen's Dominions. Of course, the words "with himself or any other man" would have to be altered, "person" being substituted for "man." There were at least two offences provided for which did not come under the existing law.

MR. HOPWOOD said, if the hon. and learned Gentleman would bear with him (Mr. Hopwood) a little longer he would see that his (Mr. Hopwood's) contention was correct. The words were—

> "By threats or intimidation procures or endeavours to procure any woman or girl to have unlawful carnal connection," &c.

—that was to say, "procures or endeavours to procure a rape."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER): Possibly, it may be so.

MR. HOPWOOD: No; certainly it is. It was, by law, a rape and a felony, and by the sub-section they would make it a misdemeanour only. They were now enacting conflicting laws—he prayed them to take care that their guidance was correct on these legal matters. If they did not take care, all sorts of confusion would result. They were endeavouring to embrace in one clause that which was a felony, and that which was a misdemeanour, in a matter that was of supreme importance in all cases of drawing up indictments in Courts of Law; and it was obvious that the clause would require a great deal of careful handling before the hon. and learned Gentleman could fulfil all the purposes he had in view. He (Mr. Hopwood) would like, further, to put it to the Committee, if the clause was to have general application and deal with cases outside the Queen's Dominions, how could it be put in force? Supposing a case occurred in France, what right would they have to put the sub-section in force in that country? They might punish a person for an attempt made in the United Kingdom; but if the offender were a foreigner, and the offence were committed abroad, they might find themselves on the edge of some considerable legal difficulties.

Of course, he did not mean to say that they could not get at such a person for what he might do within the Queen's Dominions. He was afraid that when they came to have this clause strained and tested by legal decisions they would find it full of legal difficulties, and would be greatly disappointed at the result of their Act.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, he was afraid the hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. Hopwood) had not looked at the Amendments the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross) had put down to this sub-section. The right hon. Gentleman proposed to insert, after "intimidation," "or by false pretences, false representations, or other fraudulent means," and also to leave out "himself or any other man," in order to insert "any person." The offence which was pointed to in the sub-section would have to be committed in the United Kingdom. "Without the Queen's Dominions" only had reference to the place to which the girl or woman might be taken.

Mr. LYULPH STANLEY said, this showed the extreme difficulty of the matter they were dealing with. It was admitted that the words in the sub-section as they stood included the offence of rape. ["No, no!"] He thought hon. Gentlemen must agree that "procures or endeavours to procure any woman or girl by threats or intimidation" was rape. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General said there might be threats which were not sufficiently violent to constitute rape; but everyone who went on Circuit knew that of all cases in which they had to grapple with difficult points of evidence there were none which bristled more with difficulties than cases of rape. It came to this—that in a case where the evidence was not sufficient to convict a person of rape they were going to invite the jury to convict of misdemeanour, and they were not going to allow a man to give evidence on his own behalf. If there was a case in which a man ought to be allowed to give evidence, it was a case of rape or indecent assault. Yet it was positively suggested by the hon. and learned Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) that where the evidence was not proof of rape the accused should be convicted of misdemeanour. [The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster): No.] Well, but if a man "by threats or intimidation procures or endeavours to procure any woman or girl" he was to be guilty of misdemeanour. It was admitted that there might be many threats, and when there was a small amount of threatening or intimidation the offence was to be a misdemeanour. Of course, if the woman was good looking and attractive her testimony would have great weight with the jury. Hon. Members who were in the habit of attending Assizes knew that very often charges of rape arose out of cases where there was practical consent—that some one coming up the woman had screamed to save her reputation, and a charge of rape had been preferred against the man. The Committee ought to examine this sub-section very carefully before accepting it.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he did not agree with the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Lyulph Stanley) in his objection to this sub-section. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) had very truly said there was not only a kind of intimidation — intimidation carried to a certain point—which amounted in law to rape, but that there was also intimidation, which even, if it were technically rape, would certainly not be found by a jury to be rape. It was felt that that sort of intimidation ought to be punished. Supposing a man threatened a girl with the dismissal of herself, or of her father, or some relative from employment, and because of that effected his purpose, he (Sir William Harcourt) doubted very much whether a jury would consider it rape. But surely a man who induced a girl to sacrifice her virtue by intimidation of that kind ought to be punished.

Mr. EDWARD CLARKE said, he thought the speech the right hon. Gentleman the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt) had just delivered illustrated the extremely dangerous character of what the Committee were asked to do. This clause might be divided into two parts. The first part dealt with intimidation. Now the law was perfectly clear. It was a question for the jury whether the connection took place with the consent of the girl. If the girl was only submissive, it was rape; if it was submission to threats and intimidation, which were sufficient to overcome the resistance of the mind, and the jury found that the threats and intimidation reached that point, it was undoubtedly rape. But it was said there was a lower form of intimidation, and that a girl might be threatened by something which would not overbear the resistance of the mind, but might induce her to think, as a matter of calculation, that it would be better for her to submit to the connection than to put herself or relatives to an inconvenience which was threatened. He could not imagine a more terrible instrument of oppression than such a clause. There could be no evidence in contradiction, and a woman could say anything as to having had threats used towards her. So far as the rest of the clause was concerned, it was not required at all, because the 49th section of 24 & 25 *Vict.* c. 100 was now on the Statute Book, subject to alterations. He certainly had a very strong objection to repealing a clause which had existed on the Statute Book for a good many years, in order to put a slightly different clause into an Act passed in 1885. He hoped his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General would seriously consider this matter. He certainly desired to enter his strong protest against this dangerous proposition.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Edward Clarke) seemed to have forgotten that one of the main features of this clause was to provide punishment in England for something done outside the Queen's Dominions. It was quite true that the 24th & 25th *Vict.* did cover part of this clause; but it did not provide against girls being procured for foreign parts. This was not simply a question of rape, but it was—

> "Procures or endeavours to procure any woman or girl to have unlawful carnal connection, either within or without the Queen's dominions, with himself or any other man."

Such an offence was not covered by the old Act.

MR. HOPWOOD said, it was just as if two or three persons were present, and one held the woman while the foul purpose was effected by the other. Surely an accessory before the fact was a principal either in felony or misdemeanour. A man who aided another to commit a rape was an accessory, and guilty of the crime himself.

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, he thought the Committee were indebted to the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) for having brought this subject forward; because it was plain, from the admissions of the hon. and learned Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) and the Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross), that the clause required very considerable amendment. It now seemed to be generally admitted that the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport was quite right in saying that this clause included various classes of crimes which were at present punishable as rape, and that it proposed to make a rape—which he (Mr. Horace Davey) was given to understand was at present a felony—a misdemeanour. Although the clause included rape, although it also included the accessories to rape, although it included, as the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Plymouth (Mr. E. Clarke) had pointed out, what was already made an offence, it included something more. Let the Government say what it was they meant by the clause. He was desirous of supporting the Government in carrying the Bill, and in carrying a clause which would aid in grappling with that which they all knew to be a great evil—namely, enticing English girls to brothels abroad. If that was what the Government desired to prevent, why did they not say so? Why did the Government introduce a clause which had the effect, as hon. and learned Gentlemen, who had far greater knowledge of the Criminal Law than he had—and there was no greater authority in the House on Criminal Law than the hon. and learned Member for Plymouth (Mr. Edward Clarke)—said, of including what was already a felony? At that hour of the morning (2.30) they were asked to enact that what was already a felony, according to the English law, should be a misdemeanour. That was a ridiculous position for the Committee to be placed in. It was evident that the Government did not understand their own clause, and had not thought it out; and he would, therefore, move to report Progress. Perhaps before the Committtee met again the Government would re-consider the clause.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Horace Davey.*)

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he thought they ought to go on. The question had been argued for some time, and surely it was better to settle it at once. They would not arrive at a more satisfactory conclusion to-morrow than they would to-day.

MR. LYULPH STANLEY said, the last division was taken at 2 o'clock, and the Committee were then assured that this clause would lead to no contention. They had gone on now for half-an-hour, and the discussion had shown that the clause was much fuller of difficulties than the Government imagined. He thought they were entitled at that hour of the morning to take a division, if necessary, on the Motion to report Progress.

MR. ONSLOW said, the Bill was one huge jumble; but he did not blame Her Majesty's Government one bit, because, as a matter of fact, it was not their Bill. He thought, however, that as the Government had taken up the Bill they ought to bear the responsibility of it. He intended to support the Motion to report Progress, and hoped that before the next meeting of the Committee the Government would consider what they really did intend to pass.

MR. H. H. FOWLER said, the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Christchurch (Mr. Horace Davey) made a very powerful speech against the clause, but prevented any Member of the Committee replying to him by moving to report Progress. Of course, if the attitude which the hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Lyulph Stanley) had taken up was to prevail, and if the Bill was to be practically obstructed——

MR. HOPWOOD rose to Order. He would like to know whether it was not un-Parliamentary to charge any Member of the Committee with Obstruction?

THE CHAIRMAN said, it would be out of Order for an hon. Member to charge another hon. Member with Obstruction; but he did not understand the hon. Member for Wolverhampton to do that.

MR. H. H. FOWLER said, he made no such charge. The hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Lyulph Stanley) hinted that this was a time of the morning when a minority of the Committee was entitled to insist on reporting Progress. He (Mr. H. H. Fowler) was about to say, when he was interrupted by the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) that if that course was to be adopted—he did not think the hon. Member for Oldham would adopt such a course—those who supported this Bill would be placed in a very awkward position. He (Mr. H. H. Fowler) thought it would be hopeless to go on at that hour of the morning; and therefore he would not be displeased if the Government consented to report Progress, but not on the ground that this Clause was a jumble. The clause was perfectly intelligible, and he thought the opposition to the clause was perfectly intelligible too.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he did not wish to enter into the merits of the clause or of the Amendment; but he thought that at half-past 2 in the morning the Government might fairly consent to report Progress.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

(*The Lord Advocate, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland.*)

[BILL 115.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Second Reading of the Bill be deferred till Monday next."

MR. WEBSTER said, he must appeal to the Government to move that this Order be discharged. He had no intention, at that hour of the morning (2.35), of detaining the House by discussing the merits of the Bill; but he gathered, from an answer given by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer on Tuesday, that it was hardly meant to proceed with the Bill that Session. It was now the end of July. The Bill was of a contentious character; it would be opposed at every stage; and, therefore, it was impossible to pass it in the few remaining days of the Session. On Tuesday the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) said that looking to the list of Bills on the Paper, and the opposition of himself (Mr. Webster) and other hon. Members from Scotland to the Bill, he was afraid they could not proceed with it. After such a statement it was scarcely a right proceeding to put the Bill down for next week, of course to the great inconvenience of Scotch Members and of the House generally. He strongly appealed to the Government to consent to the discharge of the Order and the withdrawal of the Bill.

Mr. HENDERSON supported the appeal of his hon. Friend (Mr. Webster). Many Scotch Members, relying upon the assurance of the Chancellor of the Exchequer on Tuesday, had left town.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he would admit the correctness of the quotation the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Webster) had made; but as this was a Bill of importance he thought the matter might remain until Monday.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Second Reading *deferred* till *Monday* next.

WAYS AND MEANS.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

Resolution [July 29] *reported,* and *agreed to.*

Ordered, That leave be given to bring in a Bill to apply a sum out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year ending on the thirty-first day of March, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament, and that Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, and Sir Henry Holland do prepare and bring it in.

Bill *presented,* and read the first time.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS (RETURNING OFFICERS) BILL.—[Bill 99.]

(*Mr. Attorney General, Sir Charles W. Dilke.*)

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

A Clause (Amendment to "The Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers' Expenses) (Scotland) Act, 1878,")—(*Mr. J. B. Balfour,*)—was twice read, and made part of the Bill.

Amendments made.

Bill to be read the third time *Tomorrow.*

House adjourned at Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 31*st July,* 1885.

MINUTES.] — Sat First in Parliament— The Lord Kenyon, after the death of his grandfather.

Public Bills—*First Reading*—Crown Lands* (224); Revising Barristers * (225).

Second Reading — Evidence by Commission * (212); Customs and Inland Revenue (No. 2) * (220); Lunacy Acts Amendment (221); Patent Law Amendment * (223).

Second Reading — Committee — Report — Third Reading—Prince Henry of Battenberg's Naturalization,* and *passed.*

Committee—Report—Public Health (Scotland) (Provisional Order) (No. 2) * (188); Poor Law Unions' Officers (Ireland) * (214); Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) * (209).

Report—Third Reading—Earldom of Mar Restitution * (217), and *passed.*

Third Reading—Medical Relief Disqualification Removal (207); Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt Practices) * (219); Bankruptcy (Office Accommodation) * (191) and *passed.*

Royal Assent — Exchequer and Treasury Bills [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 44]; Metropolis Management Acts Amendment [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 33]; Waterworks Clauses Act (1847) Amendment [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 34]; Turnpike Acts Continuance [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 37]; Public Health (Ships, &c.) [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 35]; Artillery and Rifle Ranges [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 36]; Cholera Hospitals (Ireland) [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 39]; Shannon Navigation [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 41]; Polehampton Estates [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 40]; National Debt [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 43]; School Boards [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 38]; Greenwich Hospital [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 42]; Post Office Sites [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 45]; Public Health (Scotland) Provisional Order [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. cxxvii]; Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. cxxviii]; Elementary Education Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.) [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. cxxix]; Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Public Health Act) (No. 2) [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. cxxx].

PRINCE HENRY OF BATTENBERG'S NATURALIZATION BILL [H.L.]

Certificate read; petitioner took the Oath.

The Queen's consent signified by the Lord Chancellor; Bill read 2ª (according to order) and *committed forthwith:* Then Standing Order No. XXXV. *considered* (according to order), and *dispensed with:* Bill *reported* with amendments; read 3ª, and *passed,* and sent to the Commons.

RECENT LEGISLATION—THE SOCIALISTIC TENDENCY.—OBSERVATIONS.

The Earl of WEMYSS: My Lords: In calling attention to the Socialistic character of the legislation of the last 15 years I must throw myself on your

Lordships' indulgence; and if, in order to enforce the subject and give weight to my words which they would not otherwise have, I quote at some length from authorities upon this question to which even your Lordships must bow, I trust your Lordships will bear with me. My Lords, I gave this Notice, or an equivalent Notice, in the autumn of last year; but I did not bring the matter forward, because it appeared to me as time went on that the Socialistic character of our legislation was so apparent, and that from writings in the Press and from public speeches the spread and advance of Socialism were so manifest, that I ought not needlessly to occupy your Lordships' time by bringing the subject under your consideration. I felt, indeed, that I should be like unto a man holding up a lantern to the sun. But, a short time back, my noble Friend (the Duke of Argyll), in calling attention to the circumstances under which the change of Government had taken place, made use of these words, or words to the effect—"That upon social questions there was little or no difference between the two Parties in the State." My Lords, I hold that to be the truth, and that this is the one great danger of the present time—the danger of a Socialistic rivalry between the two great Parties in the State. Now a word of warning with reference to this matter was given by a distinguished statesman, a very prominent Member of the other House of Parliament. I mean Mr. Fawcett, who unhappily is now no more. Mr. Fawcett, long ago, in one of his essays on social subjects, said—I had better read his words, for they are very forcible, and words which I think statesmen on both sides of the House would do well to take to heart—

> "Unlike the Socialism of former days, those who at the present time are under the influence of the Socialistic sentiment are beginning to place their chief reliance upon State-intervention. This growing tendency to rely upon the State is fraught with greater danger to England than to any foreign Empire. The two great political sections that contend for place and power have a constant temptation held out to them to bid against each other for popular support. Under the pressure of this temptation it may consequently happen that they will accept doctrines, against which, if their judgment were unbiassed, they would be the first to protest themselves. This peril will hang over the country."

I believe, then, that this is not only a peril which hangs over the country, but an evil from which we are now suffering. In calling attention to this question, I am well aware of the vastness of the subject. I well recollect being present at a public dinner, where a distinguished literary man was called upon to return thanks for literature. He began his speech by asking—"What is literature?" I own that I had a sinking at heart when I heard a convivial speech, at a convivial meeting, begin with such a question; and I am afraid if I ask your Lordships "What is Socialism?" you will have the same sinking at heart that I then had. But I trust so to treat this subject as to prove that your Lordships' very natural alarm caused by my question is without foundation. My Lords, there are various kinds of Socialism. There is the Socialism of the Communist, or what I might call the Socialism of the street; for that kind of Socialism has been fought out more than once in the streets of Paris, and may some day have to be fought out even in the streets of London. Then there is the Socialism of the Professor, or, as the Germans call it, the Socialism of the Chair; and there is also the Socialism of the statesman. The Socialism of the Communist may be treated very shortly. There are four very happy lines which I think accurately describe the Communist—

> What is Communist? One who has yearnings
> For equal division of unequal earnings;
> An idler, or bungler, or both; he is willing
> To fork out his penny and pocket your shilling."

That, I believe, to be a very fair description of a Communist, with the exception that I greatly doubt his readiness to fork out his penny. But, nevertheless, I have a great respect for him. The Communist knows what he means. He means business. His business is "the equal division of unequal earnings." There is no theory about him. He is a thoroughly practical man, and one respects thoroughly practical men; but remember, it is towards Communism that all our sentimental Socialism is surely and steadily tending. I come next to the Socialism of the Professor—the Socialism of the Chair. Now, we live in a time when, perhaps, more than any other, men feel for the sufferings of their fellow-creatures. It is essentially an era of humanitarianism. Philosophers and Professors in their writings are casting aside the old school of political economy and *laissez-faire*, and advocate

State-intervention as a cure for all evils. They look to the State to protect the weak against the strong, and to equalize the conditions of life. I believe, my Lords, that all these attempts will end in signal failure, and that, in the long run, it will be proved that the older school of political economy is, on the whole, sounder—aye, and more humane than that of the modern humanitarian school of philosophy. For all philosophy of the kind, whether right or wrong, which is evolved out of the heart and the inner consciousness of the writer, I have, for one, the utmost respect. But, my Lords, there is another kind of Professor, the Professor of Political Economy, who squares his principles with politics and Party needs; who, when his Party Leader sends common sense and experience in the government of men to Jupiter or Saturn, finds admirable reasons in his writings why the old school must be thoroughly wrong, and why political economy should be banished to distant planets. I will say, with regard to Professors of this type, what the late Lord Beaconsfield stated in "another place" that Prince Bismarck had said to him—"Beware of Professors." And it is to your Lordships that one should especially say—"Beware of these Professors;" for, if I mistake not, in the course of last autumn, one of them said that every one of your Lordships should be hanged. Nay, more, I think he said that none of your Lordships ought to have any existence at all; because your ancestors ought to have been hanged, and that, if they were not, they had not met with their deserts. So much for the Professors. I pass on to the Socialism of the statesman. Now, there are also two distinct types of Socialistic statesmen. There is the truly genuine philanthropic statesman, who, seeing the evils with which the world is encumbered, the suffering and distress, the oppression and cruelty by which we are surrounded, and acting on the impulses of a noble nature, makes war on these evils, and that, too, with all his energy and soul. Occasionally he succeeds, and in some cases he perhaps does good to his fellowmen; and if, in the course of his warfare against evil, he indulges, doubtless, in exaggerated language, or has recourse to ill-considered action, yet we cannot but honour and respect a man of this kind. We have, indeed, Statutes on the Statute Book which do honour to the good intentions of such men, as, for instance, the Factory Act. But the evil of that Act and all similar Acts is this—that what is good in itself—in this instance, the desire to protect young persons and children—is followed up by someone who tries to carry the principles of the Act a great deal further; and we have now Societies formed, whose object is to apply the principles of the Factory Act to adult labour in every shop in London. And, if there, why not carry them into your Lordships' households and kitchens? I say we, nevertheless, cannot but respect the philanthropic statesman who works on these lines. But there is another kind of philanthropic Socialistic statesman—the political partizan. My Lords, I can conceive such a man as this, at one time, a denouncer of State interference, and of what is called "grandmotherly government"—an admirable expression, which he, perhaps, plagiarized—and, at another time, I can understand this philanthropic Party statesman bringing in a Bill by which he is to prescribe the drinks, clothing, brushes, and number of ablutions that are to be applied, under heavy penalties, to full-grown male and female labourers engaged in certain occupations. I can understand this partizan statesman, when addressing one constituency, denouncing every man who would deprive the poor man of his beer; possibly, at some convivial meeting of his constituents, singing a well-known popular song, which imposes a heavy penalty on the eyes of those who would "rob a poor man of his beer;" and I can understand this same partizan, when representing a different constituency, going in for local option, and the tyranny of majorities over minorities. Lastly, I can understand this same partizan statesman, when invited to apply the principle of that meanest of Ministerial measures, the Hares and Rabbits Bill—I call it advisedly that meanest of Ministerial measures—to existing leases, repudiating the proposal as an insult; and I can imagine him two years later bringing in an Agricultural Holdings Bill, which broke every lease in England and in Scotland. For a philanthropic Socialistic Party statesman of this type I own I entertain feelings of very limited respect. My Lords, I do not wish to trouble your Lordships more than I have done with definitions and the theory of Socialism. I thought the best way to bring it home to your Lordships was to illustrate it in the way I have done. I have, however, now done with theory, and would come to the concrete, and invite your consideration of Bills that have been passed during the last 15 years, all of which show, more or less, a Socialistic tendency on the part of both Parties, and especially on the part of the Radical Party, in the State. Now, I have put in my Notice that I would call attention to the tendency of legislation during the last 15 years. I say the last 15 years, because, in the year 1870, we had the first Irish Land Bill, and in that Irish Land Bill you find the germ of Socialism in the way of dealing with property, which has since been followed up by so many similar measures; a germ which I venture to think has spread as rapidly, and is as fatal in legislation as the *phylloxera* in the vine, or the "*père microbe*," as the French call the germ of the cholera poison. And when my noble Friend (the Duke of Argyll)—I regret that he is not here—makes eloquent speeches, and writes able letters, denouncing the evil effects of the Irish Land Act of 1881, I wish to point out to him that, in the Irish Land Bill of 1870, you find the germ of all subsequent Land Bills, and that by assenting to that Bill—for he was then a Member of the Cabinet—he has hatched the chickens which since then have come to roost in the crofts of Mull and Tiree. My Lords, I will now point out what our recent legislation has been. It would be absurd to go into too many details; but I can classify some of the chief measures under different heads. First we have, as regards land and houses, seven Acts—namely, Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act, 1870; Agricultural Holdings Act, 1875; Ground Game Act, 1880; Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881; Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Act, 1882; Agricultural Holdings (England) Act, 1883; and Agricultural Holdings' (Scotland) Act, 1883: Eight Bills, Session 1885—namely, Compensation for Improvements (Ireland) Bill; Crofters' Holdings (Scotland) Bill; Leasehold Building Land Enfranchisement Bill; Leaseholders (Facilities of Purchase of Fee Simple) Bill; Peasant Proprietary and Acquisition of Land by Occupiers Bill; Suspension of Evictions (Scotland) Bill; Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill; and Land Tenure (Scotland) Bill. Well, my Lords, all of these measures assume the right of the State to regulate the management of, or to confiscate, real property—steps in he direction of substituting "land nationalization" for individual ownership. We then come to the question of corporate property, and we find that corporate property, like individual property, is now equally handed over to the spoiler by the State. Thus we have affecting corporate property—(Livery Companies)—two Bills, Session 1885—namely, Corporate Property Security Bill; London Livery Companies Bill: Water Companies—two Bills, Session 1885—namely, Water Companies (Regulation of Powers) Bill; Waterworks Clauses Act (1847) Amendment Bill. This year there was a Bill introduced, called the Corporate Property Security Bill, which was a most comical Bill. The object of the Bill was nominally to secure corporate property. But for whom? Not for the owners, but for those who wished to get hold of it in another Session. It provided the security which the butcher extends to his sheep when he pens them preparatory to slaughter. These Bills with regard to corporate property assume, contrary to all historical evidence, that what is absolutely "private" property is "public" property, and then proceed to subject it to State management. As to the Water Companies, my noble and learned Friend (Lord Bramwell) showed the other day how your Lordships were about to confiscate to a great extent the property of Water Companies. These measures both run in the same direction. They are attempts to subject the chartered rights of private enterprize in water supply to municipal monopolies, by first reducing the value of the Companies' property by harassing legislation. Then we come to Ships, nine Acts— namely, Passengers Act Amendment Act, 1870; Chain Cables and Anchors Act, 1871; Merchant Shipping Act, 1871; Emigrant Ships Act, 1872; Merchant Shipping Act, 1873; Chain Cables and Anchors Act, 1874; Merchant Shipping Act, 1876; Merchant Shipping (Carriage of Grain) Act, 1880; and Merchant Shipping (Fishing Boats) Act, 1883. All these are successive assertions, by the Board of Trade, of its right to regulate private enterprize and individual management in the Mercantile Marine; with the result of complete failure, as confessed by the Board of Trade in its Memorandum of November, 1883. We have now a Royal Commission inquiring into this matter; and our shipowners have been so harassed that, at one time, they seriously contemplated putting their shipping under the flag of Spain, or some other foreign country. Then we find Acts dealing with Mines, six Acts—namely, Mines (Coal) Regulation Act, 1872; Metalliferous Mines Regulation Act, 1872; Explosives Act, 1875; Metalliferous Mines Act, 1875; Stratified Ironstone Mines Act, 1881; and Slate Mines (Gunpowder) Act, 1882. These Acts constitute a State Code for the regulation of the mining industry, with the effect of lessening the sense of personal responsibility among mineowners, and of promoting a fallacious confidence in Government inspection; and as these Acts, in the main, fail to effect their purpose, further legislation is asked for, more Inspectors are demanded, and the Home Office, fearing unpopularity, listens to the demand. There is accordingly a perfect army of Inspectors growing up in consequence of this kind of legislation. Then there are Acts regulating Railways, six Acts—namely, Railways Regulation Act, 1871; Railways Regulation Act, 1873; Railways (Returns as to Continuous Brakes) Act, 1878; Railways (Food and Water for Animals) Act, 1878; Railways Regulation Acts Continuance Act, 1879; and Cheap Trains Act, 1883. All these are encroachments by the Board of Trade upon the self-government of private enterprize in railways; successive steps in the direction of State railways. In reference to Trade and Commerce, there are the following Acts and Bills now before Parliament this Session, regulating manufactures, trades, &c.:—Nine Acts—namely, Pawnbrokers' Act, 1872; Factory and Workshop Act, 1878; Employers' Liability Act, 1880; Alkali, &c., Works Regulation Act, 1881; Boiler Explosions Act, 1882; Electric Lighting Act, 1882; Parcel Post Act, 1882; Factories and Workshops (White Lead Works) Act, 1883; and Canal Boats Act (1877) Amendment Act, 1884: three Bills, Session 1885—namely, Factory Acts (Extension to Shops) Bill; Employers' Liability Act (1847) Amendment Bill; and Moveable Dwellings Bill. These measures may be summed up as being invasions by the State of the self-government of the various interests of the country, and curtailments of freedom of contract between employers and employed. I must, just in passing, allude to the Pawnbrokers' Act of 1872. That, my Lords, was the thin edge of the wedge for reducing the business of the "poor man's banker" to a State monopoly like the *Monts de Piété* in France. Then you have the Parcel Post Act of 1882, whereby the State comes in and undertakes the function of trader, and enters into an unequal competition with private enterprize for carrying parcels. There are also regulations for bakers; in fact, there is hardly any industry that is not regulated in some way or other. When we come to liquor, the following is the state of things. We find for the regulation of the trade in liquor:—Twenty Acts—namely, Wine and Beer Houses Act, 1870; Beer Houses (Ireland) Act, 1871; Licensing Act, 1872; Licensing Act, 1874; Licensing (Ireland) Act, 1874; Wine Licences Act, 1874; Beer (Justices Certificates to Retail Table Beer) (Scotland) Act, 1876; Wine (Licences to Retail) Act, 1876; Beer Houses (Ireland) Act, 1877; Beer Licences (Ireland) Act, 1877; Intoxicating Liquors (Sale on Sunday) (Ireland) Act, 1878; Habitual Drunkards' Act, 1879; Beer Dealers' Retail Licences Act, 1880; Beer (Brewing and Retailing) Act, 1880; Distillers, &c., Licensing Act, 1880; Spirit Hawking (Ireland) Act, 1880; Sunday Closing (Wales) Act, 1881; Beer (Brewing) Act, 1881; Passenger Vessel Licences (Scotland) Act, 1882; and Payment of Wages in Public Houses Prohibition Act, 1883. Six Bills, Session 1885—namely, Liquor Traffic (Local Veto) Scotland Bill; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday Bill; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (No. 2) Bill; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Cornwall) Bill; Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Durham) Bill; and Sale of Intoxicating Liquors on Sunday (Northumberland) Bill. Now, what are all these liquor measures? I was speaking just now as to the action of philanthropic and partizan statesmen with reference to liquor, and the tyranny of majorities over minorities; but these and all similar measures are nothing less than backward legislation. In physiology there is what is called "retrograde metamorphosis;" while in sporting phraseology there is a term "running heel." This legislation, my Lords, is "retrograde metamorphosis," "running heel," back to the time of the Plantagenets, when the State vainly attempted to regulate prices, wages, and all things else. It is a return to the Tippling Acts of James I., which had to be abandoned because they so signally failed. These measures are all attempts on the part of the State to regulate the dealings and habits of buyers and sellers of alcoholic drinks —attempts to coerce the sober many on account of the drunken few. But, my Lords, although we have recently read a letter calling upon the new constituencies to make Local Option the test question at the coming General Election, yet I hope that the common sense of Englishmen and their love of liberty will assert themselves, and that if put to the test at a General Election, Local Option will go to the wall. Next, we have Acts and Bills dealing with the dwellings of the working classes, &c. — 16 Acts — namely, Local Government Board (Baths, Wash-houses, Labourers' Dwellings, Recreation Grounds, &c.) Act, 1871; Sanitary Law Amendment (Lodging Houses, Meat, Water, &c.) Act, 1874; Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875; Public Health (Baths, Wash-houses, Labourers' Dwellings, Fire, Gas, Water, &c.) Act, 1875; Public Health (Baths, Wash-houses, Labourers' Dwellings, Fire, Funeral, Gas, Meat, Water, &c.) (Ireland) Act, 1878; Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1879; Seed Supply (Ireland) Act, 1879; Labourers' Dwellings (Government Loans) Act, 1879; Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Acts, 1879; Labours' Dwellings (Government Loans) Act, 1881; Labourers' Dwellings (Ireland) Act, 1881; Baths and Wash-houses Acts Amendment Act, 1882; Artizans' Dwellings Act, 1882; Labourers' Cottages and Allotments (Ireland) Act, 1882; Public Health (Fruit Pickers' Lodgings) Act, 1882; and Labourers' (Ireland) Act, 1883: Three Bills, Session 1885—namely, Housing of the Working Classes (England) Bill; Labourers' (Ireland) Bill; and Labourers' (Ireland) No. 2 Bill. All of these embody the principle that it is the duty of the State to provide dwellings, private gardens, and other conveniences for the working classes, and assume its right to appropriate land for these purposes. We have the following Acts and Bills pushing to an unlimited extent the principle of State interference in the matter of education:—nine Acts—namely, Elementary Education Act, 1870; Education (Industrial Schools) Acts, 1872; Education (Scotland) Act, 1872; Education Act, 1873; Education Act, 1876; Education (Scotland) Act, 1878; Education (Industrial Schools) Act, 1879; Intermediate Education (Ireland) Act, 1882; and Education (Scotland) Act, 1883: Four Bills, Session 1885—namely, Industrial Schools (Ireland) Bill; National Education (Ireland) Bill; Intermediate Education (Wales) Bill; and National School Teachers' (Ireland) Bill. All these measures are based on the assumption that it is the duty of the State to act *in loco parentis;* and they constitute a progressive Code of State education, which, by being supplied at less than the market value, is bringing about the extinction of voluntary systems and "Free Trade" in education, and their replacement by a universal State monopoly, after the manner of the French Lycées. Many of them provide those things that ought to be left to the instincts and affections of parents. Then there are Acts regarding recreation—four Acts—namely, Free Libraries Act, 1871; Free Libraries (Scotland) Act, 1871; Bank Holidays Act, 1871; and Free Libraries (Ireland) Act, 1877; whereby the State, having educated the people in common school rooms, proceeds to provide them with common reading rooms, and afterwards turns them out at stated times into the street for common holidays. Besides these, there are Local Government Provisional Orders, and Local "Improvement" Acts and Bills. These measures constitute a vast mass of local legislation, which is every Session smuggled through Parliament, containing interferences in every conceivable particular with liberty and property. They afford an indication of the evil effects of the example set by State Socialists to municipal Socialists. Now, my Lords, I have said enough, I think, with reference to the tendency of the legislation of the last 15 years. I have explained what the character of the legislation is. Now, what is its economic effect? I believe I may justly summarize it as follows:—Liberty curtailed, property plundered, robbery rampant, land unsaleable, enterprize chocked, capital flying away, and industry crippled. I believe all this legislation has checked enterprize and banished capital; and, in proof of the fact that capital is flying from the country, and that people are investing money rather in foreign than English Funds, I will mention a conversation I had with a wealthy Liberal Peer 18 months ago. He said—"What do you think of the state of things?" I answered—"I think they are as bad as can be?" He replied—"So do I," and then went on to say—

> "I thought land was safe; I find it is not. I comforted myself with the reflection that house property was, at any rate, secure. It turns out to be no more safe than land. There remains, I said to myself, at least the Funds—Childers has abolished them! I will tell you what I have done—I have put all my money into the Dutch 2½ per Cents."

We have thus realized Lord Sherbrooke's saying, in 1866, that—

> "Capital was a coy nymph, and had wings with which she could take flight abroad, if no longer safe in this country."

Now, what has been the result of the legislation during the last 15 years, from 1870? You have taken from the landlord in Ireland, and given to the tenant, a capital sum of £300,000,000. I have, indeed, heard the noble Lord the late Lord Privy Seal (Lord Carlingford), the executioner of the landed interest, pitifully prating on this subject, and saying—"True, we have taken from the Irish landlord one-fourth of his income; but we have thus made the remainder secure." Why, my Lords, it is just as if I were to find a policeman in my plate-closet, handing out some of the spoons to a man with very short hair, a low forehead, and pronounced underjaw, and the policeman, on my asking what he was doing there, were to say to me—"This young man has a great fancy for all your spoons, and I am only giving him one-fourth of them to make the rest safe." Such is the kind of reasoning on which the landlords of Ireland have been despoiled of a quarter of their property; and the effect of all this kind of legislation is that, in the long run, those sought to be benefited, are not benefited at all, for you are practically killing the goose that lays the golden eggs, by destroying confidence, and driving capital away from English enterprize. The general social results of such Socialistic legislation may be summed up in "dynamite," "detectives," and "general demoralization." Of the dynamite scare, we have recently had a curious instance at a very short distance from this. I recently asked the Lord Great Chamberlain (the Earl of Lathom) to allow models for the new War Office and Admiralty, now in the Victoria Gallery, to be open to the inspection of architects and other persons interested. But the Lord Great Chamberlain dared not exhibit them, lest someone should thus obtain admission to the Houses of Parliament, and blow them up. So much, then, for dynamite. How as to detectives? Why, every Member of the late Cabinet went about with the shadow of a detective at his heels; and the late Home Secretary, besides his familiar, the detective, had daily 15 policemen told off for the protection of his house—five at a time, in three relays. And, as to "general demoralization," it is not confined to Irish tenants, or Scotch crofters; it is visible everywhere. Even some of the Scotch Lowland farmers are asking to have their leases broken, rents fixed by the State, fixity of tenure, and to be repaid all the money which they have expended on their holdings during the currency of their lease. Do not think, moreover, that demoralization is confined to Scotland or to Ireland. It has even penetrated to Grosvenor Square, and to Belgravia. The other day a West End friend entertained me with a denunciation of the monstrous injustice to which he was subject through his landlord, at the end of his lease, having the power to confiscate—as he expressed it—his town tenant's improvements. In other words, my Lords, he might have said it was monstrous that he should have made a bad bargain for himself. Yes, my Lords, I was not ill-advised, when two years ago I counselled two Whig Dukes, who between them own a large portion of London, to keep their political weather eyes open, and to rest assured that the doctrines they applied to Ireland would very soon apply to houses in Grosvenor Square, Belgravia, and Covent Garden. And why have we now a block of Business in Parliament? Because the Table has been for years encumbered with unnecessary Bills, which no sooner become Acts than they lead to and necessitate further legislation on the same lines. While on the Continent people are thinking and vapouring about Socialism, we, in this country, are adopting it in our legislation. Louise Michel, the French Communist, epitomized the matter very effectively when she said—"That whereas in France Socialists stand in the dock, in England they sit in the House of Commons." She might have added—"and Communism in the Cabinet." My Lords, I have now shown, I think, with sufficient clearness, the direction in which we have been, and are travelling; but to fully appreciate the situation, we require a gauge of pace. Here it is. It is only 20 years since Lord Palmerston died, and he, be it remembered, said that "tenant right was landlord wrong." Again, Lord Sherbrooke, speaking in 1866, at the time of the "Cave," said, with reference to the politics of the time, that—

> "Happily there was an oasis upon which all men, without distinction of Party, could take their common stand, and that was the sound ground of political economy."

Well, my Lords, that oasis has turned out to be an Irish bog, possessed of its walking qualities, for it has already crossed the Irish Sea, and invaded the lands of England and Scotland. Lastly, we have had Communism, in the form of Mr. Chamberlain in the late Cabinet. Mr. Chamberlain is reported recently to have said—

> "If you will go back to the origin of things, you will find that when our social arrangements first began to shape themselves, every man was born into the world with natural rights, with a right to a share in the great inheritance of the community, with a right to a part of the land of his birth. But all these rights have passed away. The common rights of ownership have disappeared. Some of them have been sold; some of them have been given away by people who had no right to dispose of them; some of them have been lost through apathy and ignorance; some have been stolen by fraud; and some have been acquired by violence. Private ownership has taken the place of these communal rights, and this system has become so interwoven with our habits and usages, it has been so sanctioned by law and protected by custom, that it might be very difficult, and, perhaps, impossible to reverse it. 'But then, I ask, what ransom will property pay for the security which it enjoys?' What substitute will it find for the natural rights which have ceased to be recognized?"

Now, my Lords, we have here what purports to be a discovery of natural rights, and I would, in opposition to this view, draw your Lordships' attention to what Bentham said upon this subject in 1791—

> "Nature, say some of the interpreters of the pretended law of nature—nature gave to each man a right to everything; which is, in effect, but another way of saying—nature has given no such right to anybody; for in regard to most rights, it is as true that what is every man's right is no man's right, as that what is every man's business is no man's business. Nature gave—gave to every man a right to everything—be it so—true; and hence the necessity of human government and human laws, to give to every man his own right, without which no right whatsoever would amount to anything. Nature gave every man a right to everything before the existence of laws, and in default of laws. . . . How stands the truth of things? That there are no such things as natural rights—no such things as rights anterior to the establishment of government—no such things as natural rights opposed to, in contradistinction to, legal; that the expression is merely figurative; that when used, in the moment you attempt to give it a literal meaning, it leads to error, and to that sort of error that leads to mischief—to the extremity of mischief. . . . 'Natural rights' is simple nonsense; natural and imprescriptible rights, rhetorical nonsense—nonsense upon stilts. But this rhetorical nonsense ends in the old strain of mischievous nonsense. . . . 'Right,' the substantive 'right,' is the child of law; from 'real' laws come 'real' rights; but from 'imaginary' laws, from laws of nature, fancied and invented by poets, rhetoricians, and dealers in moral and intellectual poisons, comes 'imaginary' rights, a bastard brood of monsters, 'Gorgons and Chimæras dire.' And thus it is, that from 'legal rights,' the offspring of law and friends of peace, come 'anti-legal' rights, the mortal enemies of law, the subverters of government, and the assassins of security."

Which, then, do your Lordships prefer—the old philosophy of Bentham, or the new philosophy of Birmingham? But I do wrong to call it new; in reality, it is a very old philosophy. You will see it any day in the Zoological Gardens, where the monkeys having nuts, are made war upon by those who have none; it is, at any rate, as old as Barabbas, and may be termed the "Barabbasian philosophy." It has, indeed, in all times and in all lands had many professors; but they have not all been successful in their vocation, for, happily for the human race, the majority of them find their way, here at least, to Broadmoor, Pentonville, and other similar establishments, where they are maintained at the public expense. My Lords, I have now traced this question down to the time when the late Government left Office. How they found themselves in a minority I care not. I shall not speculate as to how it came about that the House of Commons, that had stuck to them through all their hopeless vacillations in foreign policy, that waded along with them through oceans of purposeless bloodshed, that had connived at and condoned the death of Gordon, finally deserted them when it came to a tax on beer. Harassed interests have still, perhaps, power in the State, and we know that beer was once potent in turning out a Liberal Government. One large brewer, I have heard, would have lost £60,000, and another £40,000 a-year, if the financial proposals of the late Government had been carried. How long the present Government will remain in Office, what the result of the General Election will be, I do not pretend to say; but my own impression is, that the new agricultural voters will follow the blaten brazen agitator who makes the largest promises, pointing to what has been done in Ireland in the matter of land as earnest of their fulfilment. I know one county where the agricultural labourer is saying—"No more parsons—no more landlords—no more farmers—the land is ours." And elsewhere candidates are saying to the labourer—"Do you want a new cottage and three or four acres of land? You shall have them." While the farmer is addressed thus—"I should like you to have security of tenure, the payment by the landlord of all your improvements, whether made with or without his consent; and something besides—this, no doubt, will be difficult to estimate, but it can be done. I further wish to see copartnery established between landlord and tenant. I wish him to be a shareholder in the land." This, my Lords, is no exaggeration of the speeches now being addressed to agricultural constituencies, and they may be summed up thus—"You gives your votes, and you takes your choice." But be that as it may, looking at the state of things which has grown up under the late Government, both at home and abroad, I confess that I heard of their defeat with satisfaction; so much so, indeed, that I gave expression to my feelings in the words with which the late Canon Kingsley, in the title of a very pleasant little book, described the realization of his life-long longing to visit the West Indian Islands. I, from the bottom of my soul, exclaimed "At last!" And now we have a new Government, what are we to expect from them? I feel that, in the matter of foreign policy, my noble Friend at the head of Her Majesty's Government (the Marquess of Salisbury) will do much, be his time of Office long or short, to tie up the broken threads of our traditional foreign policy, to the undoing of which it was the boast of the late Prime Minister that he had given his thoughts by day, and his dreams by night; and I hope that my noble Friend will so tie these broken threads, that, be his Successor who he may, he will not be able, even if he wished, again to break them; and we shall have the further security that the undoing of the policy of a Predecessor has not been so successful as to encourage its repetition. But what will the present Government do with reference to economic and social questions? A fortnight ago, I should have expressed hopes on this point, not fears; but we have had a taste of the quality of the Prime Minister lately; and, giving as I do, full credit to my noble Friend's desire to benefit the poor, still, in his proposals and in the arguments by which he supported them, I see a danger of that Socialistic race between the two Parties in the State, foretold by Mr. Fawcett. The noble Marquess supported a bogus railway in Regent's Park.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: Not bogus.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: Then I will drop the bogus and stick to my noble Friend's argument. He suspended a Standing Order of your Lordships' House, on the ground that employment was scarce in London; and if that argument means anything, it means *travaux publiques*. Again, my noble Friend has defended his Housing of the Working Classes Bill, on the ground that it is the duty of the State to provide, or by selling property below its value, to help to provide houses for those in its employ. Where, let me ask, will he draw the line—will he house the Foreign Office clerks, and all others in Government employment, including the tidewaiters and police? And, if not, why not? What otherwise does he propose, but the most glaring class legislation. Now, my Lords, I believe all this to be a mistake—a mistake, as regards those for whose supposed benefit sound principles are set aside, which, in the long run, never answers. A mistake as regards the Conservative Party; for there are many in this country who hoped that the Conservative Party on their return to power, would recall common sense and experience in the government of men from Jupiter and Saturn. We trusted, that as regards the intervention of the State, they would have taken their stand upon the firm ground so clearly laid down by Lord Macaulay 40 years ago in a passage I will now read—

> "It is not by the intermeddling of the omnipotent and omniscient State, but by the prudence, energy, and foresight of its inhabitants, that England has been hitherto carried forward in civilization; and it is to the same energy, prudence, and foresight that we shall look forward with comfort and good hope. Our Rulers will best promote the improvement of the nation by strictly confining themselves to their own legitimate duties, by leaving capital to find its most lucrative course, commodities their fair price, industry and intelligence their natural reward, idleness and folly their natural punishment; by maintaining peace, by defending property, by diminishing the price of law, and by observing strict economy in every Department of the State. Let the Government do this and the people will assuredly do the rest."

I believe, my Lords, that that is far safer ground for the Conservative Party to stand upon than that of Socialistic administration. If the Conservative Government stand upon that ground, there is hope, good hope alike for true Conservatism and our nation. But if they enter upon a race of legislative tobogganing down the slippery Socialistic slide, they must infallibly be distanced and beaten by their political opponents. And let it not be supposed that there is not a strong feeling already aroused upon this subject. Why, the Liberty and Property Defence League has, already, in three years, federated 61 Defence Associations for the protection of individual liberty and property. And, be it remembered, this desire is not confined to the well-to-do classes. Hear what Mr. Bradlaugh said upon this subject a year ago, when, in speaking in the name of the working men in St. James's Hall, on the occasion of a great Socialistic tournament he had with Mr. Hyndman, he, to use a well-known phrase, "knocked him into a cocked hat"—

> "The Socialists thought that the State could cure these evils; he thought that the State could not remedy them, but that they could only be cured slowly and gradually by the action of individuals. . . . . . And who were those against whom they talked of using force? Why the great majority of our countrymen. It was not true that the majority of the working class is on the verge of starvation. The number of depositors in savings' banks, members of benefit clubs and building societies, and holders of small plots of land, represent at least 10,000,000 of the population, and these would fight for the principle of private property."

I have now only to thank your Lordships, which I do from my heart, for the patience with which you have listened to my story; and, in conclusion, I would quote the words of one of the ablest and most independent writers on social questions, I mean Mr. Herbert Spencer, to show the tendency of all this legislation—

> "The incident is recalled to me on contemplating the ideas of the so-called 'practical' politician, into whose mind there enters no thought of such a thing as political momentum, still less of a political momentum which, instead of diminishing or remaining constant, increases. . . . . . He never asks whether the political momentum set up by his measure, in some cases decreasing, but in other cases greatly increasing, will or will not have the same general direction with other such momenta; and whether it may not join them in presently producing an aggregate energy, working changes never thought of. Dwelling only on the effects of his particular stream of legislation, and not observing how other such streams already existing, and still other streams which will follow his initiative, pursue the same average course, it never occurs to him that they may presently unite into a voluminous flood utterly changing the face of things. . . . . . . The numerous Socialistic changes made by Act of Parliament, joined with the numerous others presently to be made, will by-and-bye be all merged in State Socialism—swallowed in the vast wave which they have little by little raised."

Having thus pointed the moral of my tale, I am satisfied to leave the matter in your Lordships' hands. I will only add, that General Gordon, in that admirable journal of his, which is the real, true, monument to the man, says—

> "It is not, remember, the Government that made the British nation."

No, my Lords, it is not the Government that has made the British nation; but it is the Government that, as I have shown, is in a fair way to unmake it, by strangling the spirit of independence, and the self-reliance of the people, and by destroying the moral fibre of our race in the anaconda coils of State Socialism.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I cannot allow to pass without observation the able and eloquent speech which we have heard from my noble Friend. Partly, it was in the nature of a funeral oration, not wholly of an eulogistic character, upon the late Government, or an expression of the hopes and wishes over the cradle of the new one. But with the wishes, hopes, or condemnations of my noble Friend I do not wish to deal. There are one or two flaws in his argument to which I should like to allude. In the first place, I beg to repudiate, and repudiate with energy, the intimation or insinuation my noble Friend is rather fond of making, that in advocating the doctrines I have advocated in respect to the housing of the working classes, I am abandoning any of the distinctive principles of the Party to which I have the honour to belong. I absolutely deny that statement, and I do not need to prove my denial, for, fortunately, my noble Friend proved it for me. What authority did he cite against me to condemn and crush me? It was Lord Macaulay. I am not a follower of Lord Macaulay. And does he remember where that very eloquent passage, which I know well, comes from? It comes from a criticism of a book of the poet and distinguished writer Southey, who, during all those years of his life, was in the literary and journalistic world one of the main supports of the Tory Party. I, at all events, have not incurred the criticism of my noble Friend. I am following Southey, and not Lord Macaulay; and in doing so I maintain that I am not false to the principles of the political Party to which I belong. But that is a very small matter. The question which the noble Earl has raised is one of great importance, because undoubtedly it deals with a class of legislation which we shall have to consider, whether we like it or not, a good deal in the future. It has been considered in various countries in the world, and is looked upon with great hope by some and great terror by others. But my complaint of the doctrine which the noble Earl preaches with so much eloquence in this House is that it is deformed throughout by a serious ambiguity of expression. The word "Socialism" in his hands has a great many different meanings. Usually he employs it simply as a synonym for robbery, as a term which means taking what belongs to one man and giving it to another. I need not say that in so far as my noble Friend uses it in that sense I entirely concur with him in all his denunciations, and I am constrained to admit that in that sense much of our recent legislation has, unhappily, been tainted with Socialism. I need not repeat the indignant denunciations of my noble Friend; but he can hardly put his language so strong that I shall not concur with him. But then that is not Socialism in the sense in which my noble Friend has applied the term to such measures as the unfortunate one of mine, which he is so fond of criticizing, or many other proposals of the present day. Socialism in that sense is the application of the power and resources of society to benefit, not the whole of society, but one particular class, especially the most needy class of that society; and the main commandment of the gospel preached by my noble Friend is—"Thou shalt not use the public resources to benefit the poor." I do not know that he stated it in that crude form; but that undoubtedly lies at the bottom of much of the philosophy of Bentham and others, whom he is so fond of quoting, and is looked upon as one of the highest formulas of political economy. Whether that doctrine be right or not, or in whatever sense it be right, we in this country at least have the greatest possible difficulty in using it, because whenever we come to deal with this question of using public funds for the benefit in any way of the most necessitous class of the community, there stares us in the face the fact that the duty of sustaining the most necessitous class of the community by public funds has for three centuries formed a part of the law of England. That is so strong a fact that it vitiates every argument you can use from what is called sheer principle against measures of that kind. My noble Friend, preaching against Socialism in this sense—that is to say, against the use of public money for the benefit of the poor—is like a man who preaches teetotalism over his wine, or like the celebrated Scotch minister who took the train to Glasgow on a Sabbath morning to preach against Sunday travelling. My noble Friend is surrounded by evidences of his own utter inconsistency. He is trying to clothe himself in a garb of principle which experience and practice, and the law of this country, have riddled through and through. It is not only that we do sustain the poor by law, but the fact that we do it must necessarily affect the rest of our legislation, for a good deal of our legislation which my noble Friend calls Socialistic is defended by this—that unless you use the public resources in this or that way to benefit the poor, you will reduce them to so much distress that you will have to spend a great deal more by succouring them by means of the Poor Law. There was a very remarkable case of that some years ago. My noble Friend objected very much to some interference—I think it was with the whitelead manufactories, or some trade whose effect was to injure the health of the workmen, and throw them on the parish. My noble Friend said—"What interest is this to the public?" It was obviously the interest of the public. The State had accepted the burden of supporting those who were necessitous, and therefore everything, no matter what, which increases the number of the necessitous, or diminishes the operation of the natural causes which should restrict that number, becomes by the very existence of the Poor Law one of the highest interests of the State. But I entirely concur with my noble Friend—if he would but abandon what seems to me the very shabby and ragged ends of worn-out principles and go to higher considerations of policy and justice—I entirely concur with him that there are very great dangers in extending too far this policy of expending public money for the benefit of the State. But what I complain of is the manner in which this word Socialism is used. I think it is liable to mislead men to imagine that they have some cold, clean-cut principle on which they can rely, and some formula to which in each case they can appeal. I believe that no such formula exists. I believe that Socialism in this sense affects and spreads through the whole of your institutions, and is being taken up by some of the most powerful and conservative interests abroad; and therefore it is idle to attempt to dispose of a particular proposal by saying that it is Socialistic. Prove that it is against public policy; show that it discourages thrift; above all, show that it interferes with justice, that it benefits one class by injuring another—do these things, and you have proved your case. But do not imagine that by merely affixing to it the reproach of Socialism you can seriously affect the progress of any great legislative movement, or destroy those high arguments which are derived from the noblest principles of philanthropy and religion.

EARL GRANVILLE said, he rather sympathized with the objects that he understood the noble Earl had in view; but he thought that he probably sympathized with it more than the noble Marquess who had just sat down. He must also say that he agreed with some of the criticisms made on the noble Earl's speech by the noble Marquess. The noble Earl had spent five to seven months preparing this speech, to which he had constantly added, improving upon it as time passed.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said, he put the Notice down four or five months ago; but he had not been able to get an earlier opportunity to call attention to the subject.

EARL GRANVILLE said, then, at all events, the noble Earl must have known, at least, five months ago what he had to say, and he had no doubt but that he had been perfecting the speech ever since. Now, he rather objected that, in a speech of that sort on a subject which he considered to be of the greatest possible interest, the noble Earl should have thought it right to introduce many matters which had absolutely nothing to do with Socialism. The noble Earl had thought it right to bring in a subject of a very important nature, which had been discussed before, and would be discussed again, but which had really nothing to do with the matter. What had it to do with Socialism whether the noble Earl agreed with the foreign policy of the late Government or of the present, or whether he approved or disapproved of new regulations at the Tower or the Houses of Parliament to prevent the indiscriminate admission of the public and to afford some protection against nefarious attempts? All those matters were utterly irrelevant. He thought that the noble Earl having put himself forward as the champion of political and economical questions against both sides in the State, it was a pity that he was not more careful in the selection of his facts. The noble Earl had complained of measures intended to deal with the great question of the public health.

[The Earl of Wemyss dissented.] He understood the noble Earl certainly to take exception to the measures. Then the noble Earl brought in the question of the Budget of the late Government and its defeat. Well, he did not want to argue; but it seemed to him that the principle of the Budget of his right hon. Friend was founded on very just principles—namely, of distributing in certain fair proportions the burden of taxation between the rich and the poor. He thought it was more Socialistic for the Opposition to attack that in a manner which showed a tendency towards indirect taxation. To call the action of the late Government in this matter Socialism was absolutely absurd and irrelevant. The noble Earl brought forward another extraordinary instance of Socialism. He brought forward the instance of a Government as a debtor declining to accept public property to pay off the debt it owed unless the creditor would consent to accept smaller terms. The operation might be successful or unsuccessful as a financial measure, but to call it Socialism was absolutely absurd. He did think there was a tendency towards a mild form of Socialism, in opposing which he hoped his noble Friend would take the lead and be supported; but, at the same time, he would beg to advise his noble Friend really to consider whether it was a wise thing or not to oppose every measure in which he fancied there was some Socialistic tendency, and not to waste any power he might have for stemming that which was really Socialistic in its character.

Lord BRAMWELL said, the only exception to the principle that they should not divert public funds for the benefit of a particular class was that afforded by the Poor Law, the ground of which was that it was impossible for the State to allow people to starve for the want of means to keep them alive. But because they had that one exception were they to have others? He trusted not. With the most profound respect for the noble Marquess, he thought that they had better abide by a principle though there was one inevitable exception to it.

Earl FORTESCUE said, he would not trouble their Lordships about the legislative measures alluded to in the speeches already delivered. But he must observe that, in his opinion, much of the widespread depression undeniably so long prevalent was attributable, not to the measures only of the late Government, but also to the speeches of some of its influential Members, which he had learnt from recent inquiries had caused extensive alarm and distrust among many other capitalists, large and small, besides landowners. He (Earl Fortescue) had himself heard that more than one capitalist of his acquaintance had been led by the language of hon. and right hon. demagogues to remove his capital abroad. Though the late Government had relegated political economy to some distant planet, they could hardly deny the truth of one of its definitions, that capital was the wage fund of a country. The many unemployed labourers in England ought to know to whom they owe the transfer of part of that wage fund to the employment of their rivals in foreign countries. Mr. Chamberlain had spoken of the ransom due from property, and one of his Colleagues had tried to identify this statement with the late Mr. Drummond's noble saying—"Property has its duties as well as its rights." He (Earl Fortescue) had been honoured with the friendship of that most valuable and truly noble public servant, prematurely cut off by death in the midst of his labours. But anything more essentially different than the purely moral motive suggested to landlords by the one, and the coveting, not to say confiscation, suggested to the multitude by the other, could hardly be conceived. Happily, the language of the right hon. Sympathizer with Mr. Bradlaugh had much diminished his influence with the reasonable, thoughtful, and moral of all classes of the community.

PROSECUTIONS OF OFFENCES ACT, 1879.—OBSERVATIONS.

The Earl of POWIS called attention to the Draft Regulations submitted for the approval of the Lord Chancellor and Secretary of State under the Prosecutions of Offences Acts, 1879 and 1884 (see Commons Papers 146 and 153 of 1885); and also to the deductions as agency fees imposed by the Solicitor to the Treasury on local solicitors employed to conduct prosecutions on behalf of the Public Prosecutor under those Acts.

The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Halsbury) said, that the noble Earl was under an entire misapprehension, first of all with respect to the Regulations which he thought were in operation. He feared there was no possibility of their coming into operation for some time. By the provision of the Statute they must lie for 40 days on the Table of both Houses of Parliament before they could come into operation. They were laid on the Table of the House of Commons, but not on the Table of their Lordships' House, and therefore they could not receive the approval of Parliament as required. He thought it would be absolutely necessary that they should lie on the Table of the new Parliament before they should come into operation. That was an illustration of the great difficulty in the way of the administration of the Office of Attorney General. His right hon. and learned Friend (Sir Henry James), who had given great labour to this subject, had only the voluntary assistance he could get in his Office, and having laid those Regulations on the Table of the Library of the House of Commons it did not occur to him to do the same thing in the House of Lords. The Regulations of 1879 were still in operation. And here he must ask the noble Earl to give him his attention, because he had made a most serious mistake, the result of which was to cast an imputation on a most distinguished and deserving public officer. The noble Earl had fallen under the impression that Sir Augustus Stephenson had some interest of his own in what he called the hocus-pocus of fees and the deductions. The noble Earl had been entirely misled by some technical phraseology which there was not a solicitor in the country who did not understand. When they spoke of agency charges what was meant was the charges made by one solicitor on another. When a solicitor accepted a retainer from another solicitor he did not make the ordinary charges to a client, but half-charges. The solicitor in London directed a solicitor in the country to take up this or that case as his agent, and under no circumstances could a solicitor acting as agent obtain the full charges of a solicitor. The noble Earl was in error in supposing that the full charges were made in the first instance and that afterwards the deductions were made. The solicitors made out their bills on the agency scale and were paid on that scale. The fees which appeared in the account were the fees actually charged and paid, and there was not the smallest foundation for the imputation that had been made that Sir Augustus Stephenson augmented his salary by charging higher fees than he paid. Sir Augustus Stephenson had done his duty as a public officer in saving what he could save for the public in regard to these public prosecutions; and, on the other hand, the solicitors received every farthing for which they contracted.

CUSTOMS DEPARTMEMT—COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.—QUESTION.

THE EARL OF LIMERICK asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether the memorial of the hundred collectors of customs sent in to the Treasury more than four years ago, and to which no answer had been given, would receive consideration; and, whether it was a fact, as stated in *The Civilian* newspaper, that sixty out of the hundred and twenty-three collectorships then existing in the United Kingdom had been abolished, and many collectors made redundant and reduced to subordinate positions; and, whether any steps would be taken to provide for these officers, and to place the junior collectors in the same pecuniary position, at least, as the collectors of inland revenue?

THE EARL OF IDDESLEIGH (FIRST LORD of the TREASURY): The Memorial in question was received and in due course referred to the Customs. That Board has only recently been able to report upon it, the numerous recent changes in the organization of the Department having entirely altered the conditions which existed when it was first sent in. They have, however, now proposed to the Treasury a scheme for re-classifying the staff of collectors, which is at present under consideration, and the general result of which will be to improve the position of the collectors. The number of collectorships at the out ports has been reduced from 121 to 55; but this reduction has not been applied to any individual collector, so that none of them have suffered pecuniarily. A number of old men have retired, and the redundants have thus been absorbed. Most of these reductions have been made in the smaller collectorates, so that the average salary of a collector is higher than it was by nearly £100 per annum.

Of the 100 collectors who signed the original Petition there remain only 15 whose cases call for consideration, and some, if not all, of these will shortly be provided for. With regard to the last words of the Question, the salaries of the Collectors of customs must be fixed with regard to the nature of their duties, which are by no means comparable in many cases with those of the collectors of Inland Revenue. The smaller Customs collectors have very little money, comparatively speaking, passing through their hands.

MEDICAL RELIEF DISQUALIFICATION REMOVAL BILL.—(No. 207.)

(*The Earl of Milltown.*)

THIRD READING.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN, in moving that the Bill be now read the third time, said, he desired to thank their Lordships on both sides of the House for their forbearance, which had enabled him to pass this important Bill through the House with such facility. He sincerely trusted and believed that the experience of the next few years would prove to those noble Lords who had expressed doubts as to the expediency of such a measure that their fears had been groundless, and that in granting this important measure of franchise they had acted in accordance with the wishes of the great majority of their countrymen, and earned another title to the respect and esteem in which this House was held by the country.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3^{a}."—(*The Earl of Milltown.*)

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 3^{a}, and *passed.*

LUNACY ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

(*The Earl Brownlow.*)

(NO. 221.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE SECRETARY TO THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Earl BROWNLOW), in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, it was the same measure as had been presented earlier in the year by the noble and learned Earl who then occupied the Woolsack. Its object was simply to enable Boards of Guardians to detain lunatics in the workhouses in certain cases.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Earl Brownlow.*)

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2^{a} accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House on *Monday* next.

House adjourned at half past Six o'clock, to Monday next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 31*st July,* 1885.

MINUTES.]—PRIVATE BILL (*by Order*)—*Lords Amendts. considered*—Worcester Extension.

PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading—Second Reading—Committee—Report—Third Reading*—Prince Henry of Battenberg's Naturalization,* and *passed.*

First Reading—Second Reading—Committed to a Select Committee—Committee nominated—Earldom of Mar Restitution * [256].

Second Reading—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) *; Ecclesiastical Commissioners (No. 2)* [253]; Public Works Loans * [254]; East India (Army Pensions Deficiency) [225].

Committee—Criminal Law Amendment [159]—R.P.

Re-committed — Committee — Report—Considered as amended—Third Reading—Telegraph Acts Amendment [121], and *passed.*

Third Reading—Expiring Laws Continuance * [247]; Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers * [251], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Metropolitan Board of Works (Further Powers) * [44].

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

—o—

WORCESTER EXTENSION BILL (*by Order*).

LORDS AMENDMENTS.

Lords Amendments *considered;* as far as the Amendment in page 11, line 21, *agreed to.*

Clause 21A (Assessment of Railways), the next Amendment, read a second time.

MR. ROWLEY HILL, in moving that the House do agree with the Lords in the said Amendment, said, he felt that he occupied a somewhat anomalous position, seeing that the promoters of the Bill, the Worcester Corporation, had used every endeavour to secure the rejection of the clause proposed on behalf of the Great Western Railway Company. Before the Committee of the House of Commons the point was argued with the result that the Committee were unanimous in rejecting the clause. The Bill then in due course went to the Lords, and the Committee of the Lords inserted the clause. An attempt was made to obtain the re-committal of the Bill for the purpose of having the clause discussed; but that was objected to by the Chairman of the Committee, the Earl of Limerick, who thought that such a course would imply a reproach to the Committee, and subsequently Earl Beauchamp, on behalf of the promoters, proposed to leave out the clause on third reading. That Motion was opposed and rejected on a division by 37 to 17, and it then became a question whether he, on behalf of the promoters, should ask the House of Commons to disagree with the Lords' Amendment, for his conviction was just as strong as at first that the rating exemption allowed by the clause was an improper Amendment. It was only under stress of the pressure arising from the fear of losing the Bill altogether that he now ventured to ask the House to agree with the Amendment. The promoters had taken counsel with parties interested, and they were told that if the House now disagreed with the Amendment it would be hopeless to think of passing the Bill; it would be lost, and in such a case a severe penalty would be inflicted upon the City of Worcester. The Lords had introduced a clause which was condemned by many persons, but the Corporation were not responsible for that; they had done their utmost to prevent it, and they now asked the House not to tax the City of Worcester with the still more evil consequences that would arise from the rejection of the Bill. Very important sanitary arrangements partially carried out would be stopped, and the loss would be great. In asking the House to accept a Motion he did not approve, but which, under the circumstances, was expedient, he found a parallel in recent proceedings of the House upon an important public measure. A proposal was introduced in an important Bill to which a majority of the House attached great importance as a matter of principle. That was rejected by the other House of Parliament, and yet the Leaders of the majority in the Commons advised acceptance of the Lords' Amendment, not, as they said, because they approved of it, but because an opposite course would jeopardize the Bill, and so the Lords' Amendment on the subject of medical relief was accepted, merely because time was short, and otherwise the object of the Registration Bill would have been imperilled. For similar reasons, he begged the House to accept the Amendment to this Bill, and hoped that he would be supported by others who yet, as he did, disapproved of the clause in itself.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with The Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Rowley Hill.*)

MR. ATKINSON agreed in many of the remarks just made, but not in the Motion moved by the hon. Member. He said it was an improper clause, which could not be too strongly reprobated, but he asked the House to agree to it, because, he said, it would be prejudicial to the interests of Worcester if the House did not. The answer to that surely was that if it would be prejudicial to the City of Worcester on the one hand, and to the prejudice of all the rating authorities of the country on the other hand, then the City of Worcester ought to give way. He should vote a negative to the Motion.

SIR GABRIEL GOLDNEY said, he hoped the House would agree with the Lords' Amendment for several reasons. First, because if the House did not do so, it would put an end to those negotiations and courtesies under which Private Bill legislation was conducted. The Great Western Railway Company opposed the Preamble of the Bill before the Committee, and without producing any evidence, they requested to have a clause of this sort inserted in the exact form provided by the Public Health Act of 1875, under which they claimed partial exemption from the local rate. The Corporation of Worcester, for some reason or other, sought to pass this Bill to enable them to extend the boundaries of their borough, and include within those boundaries some 2,000 acres of what was almost all agricultural land, with a sparse population not exceeding three persons to an acre. That was with the view of making promenades, drives, or other purposes having nothing to do with sanitary regulations. The Great Western Railway, who had a line on the estate, and who within the borough paid their share of the rates, objected, and said—"if you want to do this, you should give us——

Message to attend the Lords Commissioners;—

The House went;—and being returned;—

Mr. SPEAKER *reported* the *Royal Assent to* several Bills.

WORCESTER EXTENSION BILL

(*by Order*).

Motion made, and Question again proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

SIR GABRIEL GOLDNEY remarked, that when interrupted by the announcement of a Royal Commission he was calling the attention of the House to the fact that the Amendment ought to be conceded on every principle he had ever been acquainted with in connection with Private Bill legislation during the time he had had the honour of a seat in the House. First, in relation to the interests of the contending parties; secondly, the general policy of the law; and, thirdly, the merits of the question itself. A short history of the case was this. Under the Health of Towns Act, 1875, provision was made by which a certain property outside the boundaries of a borough became liable to be rated under the general law to the district rate at one-fourth less than the general property of the town, where expenditure was rendered necessary for the sanitary purposes of the borough. The present Bill proposed to include within the boundaries of the City of Worcester an area of no less than 1,900 acres, upon which, he understood, the whole population did not amount to more than three persons an acre. The Great Western Railway Company objected to their property, now outside the boundary of the City, being taken out of the general rating principle and being included in the borough rate, on the ground that they would derive no advantage from the change, but would be simply called upon to contribute to the general rates of the City without receiving any consideration. Their contention was that there was no substantial reason for extending the boundary at all. In the Lords Committee upon the Bill, Mr. Michael, Q.C., who appeared for the promoters, stated that they were willing to give to the Railway Company the same clause as that which now existed in the Public Health Act, and upon that understanding the Railway Company withdrew their opposition. When the opponents had accepted the offer, the Preamble of the Bill was passed by the Committee; but after that had been done objection was taken to the Bill in the House of Lords, and a division was taken after the whole circumstances had been gone into in detail. The House of Lords, however, on a division, affirmed what the Committee had done by a majority of some four or five to one. The Great Western Company, the market gardeners, and the other owners and occupiers, asked for nothing more than the law at present gave them. They maintained that if it was considered desirable to extend the boundaries of the City of Worcester, the new property taken in ought to be placed under the same conditions as those which the general law now imposed. They further alleged that precedents were in their favour; and they instanced various Corporation Bills for extending existing boundaries and including a larger area, in which provisions identical with that which had been made in this case had been inserted by Committees of the House of Commons and of the House of Lords, such as the Stafford Corporation Act for creating extended boundaries, the Bedford Improvement Act, the St. Albans Improvement Act, and several others. They also asserted that two Bills had been passed in the present year, in which the same principle was carried out—extended boundaries were created; but although the new area was brought within the borough it still remained under the general law with regard to rating. Under those circumstances, as he had no desire to occupy too much of the time of the House, he would simply say that he thought the House ought to accept the Lords' Amendment. There had been, in the first place, a distinct proposal made to the opponents if they would withdraw their opposition to the Preamble of the Bill; they accepted it, and the promoters inserted a clause, which was adopted by the Committee and affirmed by the House of Lords—that clause being nothing more nor less than a provision which placed this property under the Public Health Act of 1875. There had also been precedents for the course pursued not only in previous years, but this year; and if the House decided upon upsetting the arrangement they would render Private Bill legislation practically useless and entail very onerous duties upon Private Bill Committees. They would never know what principle they ought to adopt, because it would be liable to be rejected when the Bill came before the House itself.

MR. AGNEW said, that he had served on the Committee which sat upon the Bill, and he might inform the House that the Committee was unanimous in rejecting the clause now under consideration on the ground that they saw no reason why there should be any exemption from the operation of the general law on behalf of this particular Railway Company. The hon. Gentleman had referred to an Act of Parliament which, for sanitary purposes, placed property in districts outside the boundaries of a borough in a different position from property within a borough itself; but he was not aware of any law which compelled a borough or municipal authority to make an exemption in favour of a Railway Company. He was perfectly aware of the instances to which the hon. Member referred; but having served on the Committee, and having heard all the evidence, he thought the Committee was justified in rejecting this proposal. He had been most anxious that the City of Worcester should obtain the extension of boundary which the Corporation desired, if it were not inconsistent with the interests of the locality sought to be included. No doubt, an arrangement had been made, when the Bill was before the House of Lords, whereby the promoters agreed to insert a clause exempting this railway property from assessment to the borough rates. He regretted that that course had been taken; and he thought it afforded another instance of the necessity that Parliament, at no distant day, should deal, in a comprehensive manner, with the whole question of local taxation. In the present case he thought it would have been wiser, rather than accept this clause, if the promoters had made up their minds to lose the Bill altogether, reserving to themselves the right of applying to Parliament on a future occasion.

MR. GREGORY said, it was quite true that there had been cases in which, where there had been an extension of boundaries, the provisions of the Public Health Act of 1875 were still retained, so far as the rating of railways was concerned; but there was this broad distinction between those cases and the present, that the Committee upstairs had refused to make the exemption, after a full and careful consideration of the question. He, therefore, trusted that the House would not consent to establish a dangerous precedent for the future. He should be exceedingly sorry that anything should be done which might ultimately throw out the Bill; but, as the whole matter had been fully discussed by the Committee upstairs, he thought the House ought to maintain the decision of their Committee.

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, it was quite true that the clause in the Public Health Act, to which the hon. Baronet the Member for Chippenhan (Sir Gabriel Goldney) had referred, did not, in terms, apply to this particular case; but it had been thought right by a Committee in "another place" to take it up and apply it in pursuance with a bargain which had been entered into between the various parties who were interested in the Bill. It was only on the withdrawal of the opposition that the Preamble of the Bill was passed. His hon. Friend the Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory) had spoken as if the clause applied only to the Railway Company. It applied not to the Railway Company only, but to owners and occupiers, market gardeners, nursery grounds, and other descriptions of property; and he trusted the House would not allow the promoters of the Bill to retreat from the bargain which they had made in the House of Lords.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 103; Noes 29: Majority 74.—(Div. List, No. 260.)

Subsequent Amendments *agreed to.*

QUESTIONS.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—CORK COUNTY POLICE.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If it is a fact that Head Constable Irwin, of Cork, sent a circular to several Police Stations in the City and County of Cork soliciting subscriptions towards a testimonial to Sergeant Stafford, late Chief Clerk to County Inspector Carr; whether a list of names of the subscribers has been posted in several barrack rooms; and, whether it is forbidden in the Force to ask for or give a subscription for such a purpose; and, if so, what steps will be taken with reference to this case?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): The Cork County Inspector states that no such Circular was sent out. It is not forbidden in the Force to get up such subscriptions, provided the sanction of the Inspector General is obtained. A subscription was got up in this case, and it had the Inspector General's sanction.

Mr. SEXTON: Is the right hon. Gentleman aware that the police are forbidden to subscribe for an evicted tenant?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, Sir.

EGYPT—THE SOUDAN—THE GARRISON OF KASSALA.

Mr. LABOUCHERE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether any expenditure will be incurred in the contemplated endeavour to rescue the garrison of Kassala; and, if so, whether a vote for this expenditure will be presented to Parliament during the present Session?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Bourke): The matter alluded to by the hon. Member is still under consideration; but I am sure he will see that it is inexpedient at present to make any public announcement with respect to it. With regard to expenditure, no Vote will be presented to Parliament during the present Session.

EGYPT—THE ASSEMBLY OF NOTABLES.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he can yet say whether the Assembly of Notables now convened at Cairo is the General Assembly legally elected as required by the Organic Law, and that the requirements of that Law in regard to the New Loan have been fulfilled; if he can explain how it is that when the Provincial Councils have never been called into existence, and the Organic Electoral Law, Article 39, requires the election of the elected members of the Legislative Council by the Provincial Councils, the Legislative Council can have been legally constituted, or whether, in fact, the elected members have been obtained, and how; and, whether he can give any assurance that any representative of Her Majesty's Government, deputed to Egypt, will urge the fulfilment of the provisions of the Organic Law in regard to self-governing institutions, which have hitherto been neglected, so that the machinery of self-government may be provided and got into working order as soon as possible?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Bourke): The Assembly of Notables now convened is the Assemblée Générale; but whether its members have been legally elected or not I cannot undertake to say, that being a matter of Egyptian law. I can only refer the hon. Member to Sir Evelyn Baring's despatch of October 20, in Egypt, No. 18, 1885, p. 12, in which it is stated that the Legislative Council has been convoked, and has done careful work as a consultative body. But as to its constitution, I cannot say whether it has been carried out in strict conformity with Article 39 of the Organic Electoral Law or not. I am sure, Sir, that any Representative of Her Majesty's Government deputed to Egypt will pay attention to the important subject mentioned in the Question. But what his recommendations will be with respect to it, it would be premature for me to predict.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL asked whether, as the General Assembly, under the Organic Law, could only be brought together by an election all over the country of the same character as a General Election in this country, that election had yet taken place?

Mr. BOURKE: I have looked very carefully into the Organic Law, and I am unable—I tell the hon. Member frankly—to reconcile the terms of the law with the information we have received at the Foreign Office; but this is a question for the Egyptian Government as much as for Her Majesty's Government. I will be very glad to make a representation that the Organic Law should be carried out.

Mr. M'COAN inquired whether the whole of the Egyptian law did not lie within the four corners of the Organic Law, and, therefore, ought to be intelligible to the Foreign Office?

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL asked whether the Government would insist upon their Agents being informed whether the Organic Law had been carried out?

Mr. BOURKE said, he could not at the present moment give any further information than that which was in the hands of Her Majesty's present Government, and also of the late Government.

MOROCCO—SUPPRESSION OF JOURNALS.

Mr. LABOUCHERE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether his attention has been called to statements in the French papers respecting the endeavours of Sir John Hay, Her Majesty's Representative in Morocco, to cause the suppression of *The Times of Morocco*, *The Al-Moghreb*, a journal published in Spanish, and *Le Reveil du Maroc*, a journal published in French; and, whether he is acting in this matter under the instructions or with the approval of Her Majesty's Government?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Bourke): Sir John Drummond Hay has not taken any steps to bring about the suppression of the newspapers alluded to; on the contrary, he has deprecated the adoption of any such extreme measure. The Moorish Government have repeatedly complained to him of the insulting language used in certain papers respecting the Sultan of Morocco and the Moorish Government, as well as regards Foreign Governments and their Representatives in Morocco, and has urged their suppression. Sir John Hay has confined himself to warning the editors to be careful to avoid the insertion of language of a character to justify the Moorish Government in taking measures against the papers. His action in the matter is approved by Her Majesty's Government.

Mr. M'COAN: Will the right hon. Gentleman say whether Sir John Drummond Hay has any power actually to suppress any newspaper whatever? Under the Capitulations he has none.

Mr. BOURKE: Certainly not, Sir.

EGYPT—THE INTERNATIONAL GUARANTEE.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, What is the position of the Egyptian Loan with regard to the guarantee of the Powers; and, whether it is intended to delay the issue until the guarantee has been accepted by the Parliaments of Germany and Austria; and, if so, when is that acceptance likely to be completed?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Bourke): With a view to facilitate the issue of a loan for £9,000,000 by the Egyptian Government the Powers, under the Convention of the 18th of March last, agreed that the Khedive should, with the authority of the Sultan, issue a Decree, which Decree the Khedive undertook to promulgate, in the terms of the draft annexed to the Convention. Amongst the provisions of that Convention was the following:—

> "The Governments of Great Britain, Germany, Austria-Hungary, France, Italy, and Russia undertake either to guarantee jointly and severally, or to ask authority from their Parliaments to guarantee jointly and severally, the regular payment of the annuity of £315,000."

When Her Majesty's present Government came into Office they found that the authority of the German, Austrian, and Italian Parliaments had not been obtained by their respective Governments, and those Parliaments had separated without any prospect of meeting for some months to come. It is not necessary now to enter upon the question of the discussion which took place between Her Majesty's late Government and the German Government upon this subject, as Papers will be laid upon the Table. It is sufficient now to say that when Her Majesty's Government assumed Office they found the issue of the loan was practically suspended. The negotiations which have taken place since have resulted in an a greement on the part of Germany, Austria, and Italy to give an undertaking that the loan should be submitted for ratification as soon as their Parliaments meet, and to consent to the issue of the loan at once in anticipation of this consent; and this has been agreed to by the other Powers. The Decree annexed to the Convention has been issued, with an alteration enlarging the facilities for issue and payment of coupons, which was provided for by a declaration on the part of the Powers. The loan, in accordance with these agreements, was issued on Tuesday.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD: In view of the important statement made by the right hon. Gentleman, I would venture to ask him whether he will undertake that the Correspondence between the Government and the Foreign Powers on the subject shall be distributed before Wednesday next, which will probably be the latest occasion on which the subject will arise?

MR. BOURKE: I can only say that the Papers are in preparation. Of course, we are well aware that Parliament will wish to see these Papers as soon as possible; but I am not quite certain that I can promise the hon. Member an answer in the affirmative to the Question he has just put.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD: I will repeat the Question on Monday.

MR. LABOUCHERE: Are we to understand that the Loan is not guaranteed either by Austria, Germany, or Italy?

MR. BOURKE: By the Parliament of those countries—no.

NAVY—DOCKYARD EXPENDITURE.

MR. GOURLEY asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, To be good enough to inform the House if it is his intention to appoint a Departmental Committee to inquire into the present system of Dockyard expenditure; if so, whether he will consent to add to the Committee a few men independent of the ordinary official routine of Admiralty work?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE ADMIRALTY (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON): I stated yesterday the circumstances under which a Committee was appointed by the late Board of Admiralty and the nature of the inquiry they were directed to make; and until that inquiry is completed, it is not our intention to extend the scope of their investigations.

ARMY—GUNNERY EXPERIMENTS WITH DYNAMITE.

MR. GOURLEY asked the Secretary of State for War, If his attention has been called to the gunnery experiments now being conducted by the United States Government with dynamite cartridges; if so, whether he intends ascertaining, by practical experiments, how far the system is a success?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): The attention of the War Office has been called to recent experiments with dynamite projectiles in the United States, and the subject is now under the consideration of the Ordnance Committee.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND—THE VICAR OF ST. MARK'S, SOUTH SHIELDS.

MR. BROADHURST asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether, since answering the Question on the 23rd instant relating to the bankruptcy case of the Vicar of St. Mark's, South Shields, he has seen a Report in *The South Shields Daily Gazette*, of 10th July, of the proceedings in question; and, whether, having regard to the seriousness of the statements there contained, assuming them to be true, he has any reason to modify the statement he formerly made on this subject?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Mr. E. STANHOPE): Owing to the courtesy of the hon. Member I have now seen the report in *The South Shields Daily Gazette;* but I find nothing in it at all inconsistent with the statement I made the other day. Indeed, it appears to confirm substantially the account given by the Vicar himself. Further inquiries, are, however, being made, with the view to determine whether the position of the school account has been, or is likely to be, affected by the Vicar's pecuniary difficulties.

LAW AND JUSTICE—THE JEFFRIES CASE—MR. EDLIN, ASSISTANT JUDGE.

MR. PICTON (for Mr. W. FOWLER) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Judge who tried the Chelsea case of Mrs. Jeffries has yet returned; and, whether he can now give the House the information which was withheld by reason of the absence of the Judge?

Mr. CALLAN wished, before that Question was answered, to ask whether it was true, as stated in *The Dublin Daily Express*, that the prolonged leave of absence given to Mr. Edlin was given to him without application made at the time, and that previous to the trial of the Jeffries case the application made by Mr. Edlin for leave of absence was persistently refused by the late Home Secretary?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross): I cannot tell anything as to that. I presume leave of absence was given in the ordinary course. In regard to the Question on the Paper, I object to the word "withheld," for I have nothing to withhold, neither would I have withheld anything if I had. There is a very long letter from the Judge at the disposal of the hon. Member if he would like to see it. He says—

> "On my arrival in Court I did see the leading counsel in my own room. This I did at their own request, and in accordance with precedent and custom. There is not a shadow of foundation for the statement that I suggested the defendant should plead guilty; on the contrary, I told counsel I should express no opinion as to what the sentence should be until I had conferred with my brother magistrates. The sentence was proposed by a magistrate of great experience. I concurred in it, and thought it just and proper. It was adopted almost unanimously, there being one dissentient, and he was in favour of a smaller fine."

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: As to the leave of absence given to Mr. Edlin, I have to say that the application never came before me. I have not inquired into the matter, and I have no recollection of it; but I have no doubt that, as a matter of course, leave would be given by the Under Secretary.

Mr. CALLAN: Is it not a fact that for a period of two years before the Jeffries case leave of absence was refused to Mr. Edlin?

[No reply.]

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—THE CIRCUIT SYSTEM.

Mr. WHITLEY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Government will, during the Recess, consider the present circuit system, and especially the best mode of providing increased facilities required in the large centres with regard to the trial of actions in other Divisions of the High Court besides the Queen's Bench?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross), in reply, said, that the Judges had arranged to try all actions entered for trial at the various Assize towns during the present Assize Circuit. It had not been brought to the notice of the Lord Chancellor that any action set down in any place for trial had not been tried there; but if any question relating to the system of Circuits should require to be considered, the Lord Chancellor would be ready to consult with the Judges on the subject.

EGYPT—COLONEL DE COETLOGON.

Mr. LEAMY (for Mr. Marum) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Agent and Consul General at Cairo has reported upon the case of Colonel De Coetlogon, as requested by Lord Edmond Fitzmaurice; and, whether any, and, if so, what reply has been received from the Egyptian Government?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Bourke): Yes, Sir. The Egyptian Government hold that General Gordon's recommendation that Colonel Coetlogon should be awarded six months' pay as a gratuity was founded on the assumption that his services would no longer be required by the Egyptian Government; whereas immediately on his return from the Soudan he was appointed a Divisional Inspector of Police.

POLICE ENFRANCHISEMENT EXTENSION BILL.

Mr. COLERIDGE KENNARD asked the honourable and learned Member for Beaumaris (Mr. Morgan Lloyd) and the honourable and learned Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce), Whether they will consent to withdraw the "blocks" they have placed on the Police Enfranchisement Bill, and allow it to go into Committee before the close of the Session?

Mr. BRYCE said, he felt bound to take any steps he could to secure that the Bill should not be passed hurriedly and silently at the end of the Session, and when it had not been considered by the public. At the same time, as he shared the opinion that the practice of blocking was much abused, he did not put down his Notice until he had satisfied himself that a very large number shared his objection to the measure. If the hon. Member would arrange with the Government to bring on the Bill, or to allow the hon. Member to bring it on, before 1 o'clock on Monday, and to arrange so that there might be an opportunity for discussion, he would take off his block.

ARMY—ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT—WIDOW OF MR. FREDERICK RANCE.

Mr. BOORD asked the Surveyor General of the Ordnance, Whether it is a fact that the widow and six children of the late Mr. Frederick Rance, an artificer of the Royal Laboratory, Woolwich Arsenal, who died of injuries received from the explosion of a shell on the 26th February last, have been awarded £10 per annum as a compassionate allowance; whether the widows and families of those who have previously lost their lives under similar circumstances had not, in some cases, been granted the amount of the full pay of the deceased, and, in others, the amount of pension or superannuation allowance to which the deceased would have been entitled at the date of his death; whether, at the time of his death, Mr. Rance was entitled, in the event of being rendered unfit for further service, to a pension of from 12*s.* to 14*s.* per week; and, whether he will reconsider the case, with a view to an increase of the allowance proposed?

The SURVEYOR GENERAL of ORDNANCE (Mr. Guy Dawnay): The widow of the late Mr. Frederick Rance has been awarded a compassionate allowance of £10 12*s.* 6*d.* a-year, and a gratuity of £44 on behalf of her six children, under the Regulations laid down by the Treasury for such cases. With regard to the second paragraph of the hon. Member's Question, there is no record of the full pay of the deceased, or the amount of pension to which the deceased would have been entitled, having been granted, under similar circumstances, to the widow. Mr. Rance would not, under ordinary circumstances, have been entitled to any pension in the event of his unfitness for further service, unless the unfitness was caused by injuries received in the execution of his duty. In such a case the compensation would have been regulated by the nature of the injury. With reference to the concluding inquiry, I should explain that it rests with the Treasury to award compassionate allowances, and the Secretary of State has no power to increase the amount awarded.

H.M. STATIONERY OFFICE—GOVERNMENT PRINTING.

Mr. BROADHURST asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether, having regard to the fact that by the terms of the new Schedules for the Government printing, involving an annual expenditure of over £100,000, and to the fact that the proposed contracts are for a term of ten years, the House will have any control over the selection of the printer, seeing that it has had no control over the terms of the contracts?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Sir Henry Holland): The contracts referred to will be offered for public competition, and the tenders will be dealt with in the ordinary manner. This being so, it appears to me that the matter is essentially one for the Executive Government, and that this House could not, with advantage, interfere in it. I may remind the House that the printing of the Votes and Proceedings will continue, as heretofore, under the control of Mr. Speaker.

INDIA (FINANCE, &c.)—THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Secretary of State for India, To consider the expediency of printing and circulating an Indian Financial Statement, and, by allowing the Debate on Indian Finance to be based on the usual Resolutions, thereby save the time in discussing the Affairs of India by at least two hours, which would be needed in speaking on the Indian Statement?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Lord Randolph Churchill): The hon. and gallant Member makes an admirable suggestion, which might with advantage be applied to all the annual Departmental Statements; but I do not think there is time to carry it into effect this year before Thursday next, on which day it may be convenient for the hon. and gallant Member and other hon. Members to know I shall, with the permission of the House, make the usual Statement in regard to Indian Finance.

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—THE SUB-COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. SEXTON (for Mr. Gray) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is intended to break up two of the Irish Land Sub-Commissions; whether it is a condition of the engagement of the Legal Sub-Commissioners that they should not undertake any other legal business; what notice has been given, or will be given, to those Commissioners whose services are about to be dispensed with; and, whether he is now in a position to state the names of those who will be retained?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): It has been decided to dispense with the services of two Sub-Commissions from this date. I believe it is understood that the whole time of the legal Assistant Commissioners should be given to their duties under the Land Commission. The Warrants of all the Sub-Commissioners, except those appointed for seven years, stated on the face of them that the appointment would expire on this date. The following will now receive new Warrants of appointment to the end of the present year:—namely, Messrs. Bourke, M'Devitt, Hodder, and Doyle, legal Commissioners; and Messrs. Comyn, Walpole, Cunningham, Barry, Bomford, Weir, Sproule, Guiry, and Golding, lay Commissioners.

IRISH INDUSTRIES—A ROYAL COMMISSION.

Mr. SEXTON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, considering the number, extent, and complication of the questions involved in the Inquiry respecting the state of Irish Industries (as disclosed in the evidence taken this Session before the Select Committee), and also, having regard to the fact that the question of trade depression is substantially an English question, and that the chief lines of the two inquiries must stand apart, the Government will recommend the appointment of a Royal Commission to utilize the interval before the assembling of the new Parliament in collecting such information as may aid the House to reach a practical conclusion with reference to the industrial condition of Ireland?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: When the hon. Gentleman asked this Question before I did not understand that he referred to the Inquiry which had already been intrusted to a Committee of this House, appointed, I think, on the Motion of the hon. Baronet the Member for South Warwickshire (Sir Eardley Wilmot). I understand that that Committee has taken evidence which has not yet been circulated, and will make no Report this Session. Those who have a strong feeling that the Inquiry should be continued will have an opportunity of moving for the re-appointment of the Committee next year. As the Inquiry has been intrusted to a Committee of this House, I do not think there is any reason why a Royal Commission should be appointed.

Mr. SEXTON: Has the right hon. Baronet not considered the precedent in the case of the municipal inquiry begun by a Select Committee of this House, and continued by a Royal Commission; and, considering the urgency of the matter, does he not consider that the interval between now and the beginning of next Session should be utilized by a Royal Commission?

[No reply.]

SCIENCE AND ART—EXAMINATIONS IN DRAWING—FAILURES TO PASS.

Mr. PICTON asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether his attention has been called to the extraordinary number of failures at the last drawing examinations of the Science and Art Department; and, whether any instructions had been given to the examiners to raise the standard of examination, or whether any other explanation can be given of the remarkable diminution of the number of passes?

The VICE PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL (Mr. E. Stanhope): No instructions have been given to the examiners to raise the standard at the last drawing examinations. The examinations of the more advanced grades, formerly confined to students who had previously shown capability, have this year been thrown open without restriction. This has led to the examination of a much larger number of candidates and a decline in the percentage of success; but there has been a large increase in the number of passes. The figures are these:—In 1884, out of 424 candidates 203 passed; in last examination, out of 1,530 candidates 331 passed.

SEED SUPPLY (IRELAND) ACT—NON-PAYMENT OF THE SEED RATE.

Mr. JUSTIN M'CARTHY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, considering the low price of stock and farm produce of every kind in many parts of Ireland now and the general depression of agriculture, the Government will consent to the request made by several Poor Law Unions, that the time for the repayment of the last instalment of the Seed Rate, now due, should be extended to the 1st of November?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): Whenever reasonable ground is shown for the extension of the time for repayment of this loan the Local Government Board are quite prepared to recommend the application to the consideration of the Board of Works, who, I am informed, act leniently in cases of this kind. Each application must be dealt with on its own merits.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES BILL.

Mr. SEXTON (for Mr. Gray) asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he will consent to extend the provisions of the Housing of the Working Classes (England) Bill to urban sanitary districts in Ireland?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross), in reply, said, that Ireland was not included in the Bill originally, because the Report as to Ireland had not been presented when the Bill was prepared. That Report, however, was now completed, and Ireland would be included in the Bill. Scotland would also be included.

TELEGRAPH ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

Mr. Alderman W. LAWRENCE asked the right hon. Gentleman the late Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), Whether he would move a clause in the Telegraph Acts Amendment Bill that two, three, or four figures in an address should be counted as one word, and that the rate should be ½*d.* per word instead of 1*d.* for two words?

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE, in reply, said, that the question whether several figures were to be counted as one word in a telegram would not be dealt with by the Telegraph Acts Amendment Bill, but would be left to the Post Office Regulations. With respect to the substitution of ½*d.* per word rate in place of 1*d.* for two words, he should move to re-commit the Bill for the purpose of introducing an Amendment making that alteration. This would also give the hon. Member for Blackburn (Mr. Briggs) an opportunity of moving the Amendment which he withdrew last night, on the understanding that it could be moved on Report.

Mr. Alderman W. LAWRENCE: Will the right hon. Member be prepared to take the name of any street, grove, terrace, garden, &c., as one word—that is to say, take Oxford Street as one word —and will he also be prepared to treat the name of an Island as one word, such as in the case of the Isle of Wight, the Isle of Man, the Isle of Bute, the Isle of Skye, the Isle of Arran, the Isle of Lewis, &c.?

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: I will say "No" to both of these Questions.

Mr. Alderman W. LAWRENCE, in consequence of the answer of the late Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), gave Notice that on re-committal of the Bill he would move a clause that the name of any street, square, terrace, &c., &c., and the name of any island be counted as one word.

Mr. PULESTON asked the Postmaster General, whether he assented to the proposition that there was no financial difference between the ½*d.* per word and the 1*d.*?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord John Manners) said, the officers of the Department gave him to understand that the substitution of ½*d.* per word would produce precisely the same financial result.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked, Whether, in view of the opposition likely to be offered to the Housing of the Working Classes (England) Bill from Building Societies and other quarters, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would consider the advisability of giving precedence to the Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I must wait until Monday before I make any statement. We must see how we get on with the Criminal Law Amendment Bill.

Mr. LABOUCHERE inquired whether, if the Appropriation Bill were not opposed that night, it would be put down on the Paper for its last stage in reasonable time to allow of discussion?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that the hon. Member's request was reasonable, and he would take care that the last stage of the Bill should be taken in time to allow of discussion.

MOTIONS.

——o——

PRINCE HENRY OF BATTENBERG'S NATURALIZATION BILL [*Lords.*]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the first time."—(*Mr. Stuart-Wortley, Under Secretary of State for the Home Department.*)

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: Does this Bill incur any expense?

[No reply.]

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Standing Orders relating to Naturalization Bills be suspended, and that the Bill be read the second time."—(*Mr. Stuart-Wortley.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Standing Orders suspended.

Bill read a second time, and *committed.*

Mr. STUART-WORTLEY: I beg to move that the remaining stages of the Bill be now taken.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I really want to know what occasion there is for this great hurry? What the better will he be after this naturalization has happened? You may turn him into anything. I have not seen the Bill. Will it incur any expense?

Mr. STUART-WORTLEY: I move that the Speaker do now leave the Chair.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: I have no objection to this Bill; but I should like to know what it is all about.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order. The hon. Member can make any observations after I have put the Question.

Motion made, and Question put, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Sir WILFRID LAWSON: I have no object except to ask what the Bill is, and why it is hurried through all the stages in this manner? That is all I want to know.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The Bill is for the naturalization of Prince Henry of Battenberg, and that is a Bill which we have no doubt will receive the general and cordial acceptance of the House. It is proposed to carry it through the several stages in this manner, because it has always been the custom with regard to Bills of this kind. It follows the exact precedent of a similar Bill in 1880, which was carried through all its stages at one Sitting of the House. There is, I believe, some further reason for haste on this subject which has induced us to make the proposal that the precedent set in 1880 should be followed now. I believe it was carried in precisely the same way in the other House.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR: May I ask whether the passing of this Bill is a condition precedent to Prince Henry of Battenberg's appointment to high command in the Army?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I think I need hardly answer that question.

Mr. BROADHURST: Has this Bill ever been printed?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross): It is not customary to print these Bills, and there has not been time.

Mr. BROADHURST: It is a most extraordinary proceeding, I venture to observe, that we should be asked to pass a Bill for the naturalization of a gentleman of whom we know little or nothing. ["Oh!"] I speak for myself, and not for Gentlemen on the other side. [Mr. Warton: Hear, hear!] It is a most extraordinary proceeding that we should naturalize a gentleman of whom we practically know nothing, and not have the Bill printed before we are asked to pass it through all its stages.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that the reason why it was necessary to have an Act of Parliament in this case was because Prince Henry of Battenberg had not fulfilled the condition of residence for a certain time in the United

Kingdom. If he had, no Act would have been necessary at all, and the Prince would have been naturalized by the natural process under the authority of the Secretary of State, and the end would have been attained in a day or two. If it had not been that he was a foreigner, and had not fulfilled the condition of residence, the House would have heard nothing at all about it, and the Prince would have been naturalized as a matter of course. His hon. Friend (Mr. Broadhurst) had said they knew nothing at all about the Prince. On the contrary, they knew a great deal about him, and they knew he was married to a daughter of the Queen. In these circumstances, the proposal now before the House was perfectly reasonable. He did not know what the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer meant when he said there was a particular reason for haste; but surely it was a Bill to which it was inconceivable that any objection could be raised.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS said, he did not think there would be any objection to the proposal; but the Chancellor of the Exchequer having stated that there were special reasons why the Bill should be passed, perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would tell them what the special reasons were?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I believe the fact is that this ought really to have been done before.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported*, without Amendment; read the third time, and *passed.*

EARLDOM OF MAR RESTITUTION BILL [*Lords.*]

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the first time." — (*The Attorney General, Sir Richard Webster.*)

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL asked if it was in Order to read a Bill for a first time in this manner? It was a peculiar Bill, and he would like to know why this extraordinary course was being followed?

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill has been brought down from the other House, and it is read a first time as a matter of course.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The object is to obtain the Royal Assent for the Bill.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Attorney General.*)

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL rose to ask Mr. Speaker to rule whether, before such a Motion could be made, the suspension of the Standing Orders was not necessary?

Mr. SPEAKER: There is no Standing Order applicable to the case; but it is only to be done in order—and I understand the Attorney General is going to take this course—to refer the Bill to a Committee in the ordinary way.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL protested against this extraordinary, this very irregular course. He knew something of the character of this Bill, for he had read the debate in "another place." It was a Bill of this character. A gentleman had claimed the title and Earldom of Mar, which the highest tribunal of the country decided he was not entitled to. But the Committee of the House of Lords now said that he was entitled to it, and the Bill was to restore the ancient Earldom of Mar. That might be right or it might be wrong; but he protested against this measure being taken before other very important matters now before them.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, that, as he understood it, the matter stood thus: On a previous inquiry there was some technical difficulty in regard to the reception of certain evidence. This Bill had passed the other House with a view to remove the technical difficulty. It was his intention at once to move that the Bill be committed to a Select Committee; but, of course, he presumed that everything would be dealt with by that Committee. He understood there was no Standing Order applicable to the matter which he had moved; and he presumed that if the Bill were referred to a Select Committee there would be no objection to its being read a second time.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* to a Select Committee.

Committee *nominated*:—Sir ARTHUR OTWAY, Sir MICHAEL HICKS-BEACH, Secretary Sir RICHARD CROSS, Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL, Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL, Sir HENRY JAMES, Sir FARRER HERSCHELL, Mr. COCHRAN-PATRICK, and Dr. FARQUHARSON.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, the Attorney General had told them this was a Bill to enable certain evidence to be received; but from the debate in "another place" he understood it was for the restitution of the Earldom of Mar. He had the strongest objection to that, which, he held, was an unprecedented course to take after the decision of the highest legal tribunal of Scotland. The Bill ought to be printed, and before allowing it to pass this stage they ought to know what the Bill was.

SIR WILFRID LAWSON: Perhaps it would facilitate matters if the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) were put on the Committee.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL: I object, Sir.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I beg to move, Sir, that the name of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy be added to the Committee.

Motion *agreed to*; name *added*.

Ordered, That Three be the quorum.

Ordered, That the Committee have leave to sit and proceed upon *Monday* next.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I understand that there is an old and obsolete practice that it is usual to move that all the Members of the Privy Council and all the Members of the Long Robe in the House be added to the Committee; but I do not intend to follow that practice on the present occasion.

Bill to be *printed*. [Bill 256.]

THE PAPAL SEE—DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATION WITH THE VATICAN—SIR GEORGE ERRINGTON.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he knew anything of a letter published in this week's issue of *United Ireland* purporting to be addressed by Sir George Errington to Earl Granville, as Foreign Secretary, in which Earl Granville was informed that it

> "is necessary to keep the Vatican in good humour with you"—

that is, the English Government—

> "in order to have your nominee appointed to the Archbishopric of Dublin?"

He wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether there was any record of such a letter, or a letter of a similar character, in the Foreign Office; if so, whether the Government would not feel it to be its duty, in view of the feeling amongst Orangemen with regard to the connection of the Government with the Vatican, to indicate their opinion of such conduct on the part of their Predecessors in reference to the Archiepiscopal See of Dublin?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. BOURKE): In answer to the Question of the hon. Member, I beg to say that I have not seen the letter referred to, and that I have told the House before that I have not read the Correspondence which took place between that gentleman and the late Government. If the hon. Gentleman wishes for further information on the subject, and puts down his Question, I shall be happy to answer it.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I will put down the Question, and will ask the right hon. Member whether the Government will not consider it necessary, especially amongst Orangemen, who regard with disfavour any relations between the British Government and the Vatican, to set public opinion right?

MR. BOURKE: If the hon. Gentleman puts down a Question on the subject, I shall be glad to consult with the Prime Minister on it. I cannot take any steps of this kind without his consent.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL [*Lords*.]—[BILL 159.]

(*Secretary Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 30th July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 3 (Procuring defilement of woman by threats or fraud).

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 22, to leave out Sub-section (1.)—(*Mr. Hopwood.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'By' stand part of the Clause."

Mr. H. H. FOWLER said, the Amendment which his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) had submitted to the Committee proceeded upon the theory that the offence defined by the sub-section already amounted in law to the crime of rape, and that if the sub-section were passed as it stood the effect would be to convert what was now a felony into a misdemeanour. Several hon. Members seemed to be of that opinion; but some hon. Gentlemen, not following the law of the hon. and learned Member for Stockport, rather rested their opposition to the sub-section on the ground that the sub-section would introduce a new offence, which might be the cause of considerable extortion, and possibly of great injustice. What he (Mr. Fowler) wished to submit to the Committee was this. If his hon. and learned Friend was right in the contention that procuration by threats and intimidation already amounted to the criminal offence of rape, then, no doubt, the sub-section ought to be omitted, because the Committee would not wish to convert into a misdemeanour what was already a felony. But there were equally great authorities — he referred especially to the Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) — who maintained the opinion that there were offences which fell within the four corners of the sub-section, but which did not amount to the offence of rape. Admitting, then, that the offence described was an offence which ought to be punished—and the hon. and learned Member for Stockport did not dispute that grave doubts were entertained by lawyers as to whether the existing law covered it or not—it was surely wise for the Committee at once to deal with it, and put that disputed question beyond all doubt for the future by making a misdemeanour of the offence which did not already amount to rape. He would not trouble the Committee with any arguments on the point; but he believed there were cases of threats, and what might be described as intimidation, which did not in law amount to rape, and upon which no jury would give a conviction if the charge of rape were preferred. There was, however, one thing to which he wished to draw attention. The hon. and learned Member for Christchurch (Mr. Horace Davey) had spoken satirically of the Government not knowing their own minds about the Bill, and about their own clause. He (Mr. Fowler) wished to point out that the clause was not the clause either of the late or of the present Government. It was introduced into the Bill in the House of Lords by so great an authority as Lord Bramwell, who drew it, and who was, of course, aware of the existing state of the law. The clause was inserted at the instance of Lord Bramwell, and was accepted by the Government, because they were of opinion that there was an offence, not dealt with at present, which this clause could deal with, and ought to deal with. He (Mr. Fowler), therefore, asked the Committee to retain the sub-section, as it dealt with a matter about which lawyers differed, and would make a misdemeanour of a very serious offence.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, he did not think his hon. Friend the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. Fowler) had quite grappled with what was before the Committee. It was now conceded that to obtain possession of a woman by threats or intimidation was clearly a rape in law. They had had some trouble to get that conceded; but now it was beyond doubt. But it was further argued that there might be some threats and intimidation which did not amount to rape—in cases, for instance, as he presumed, where the threats or intimidation had not procured the submission of the girl. If they had procured the submission of the girl, he did not see how that could amount to anything less than rape. It was urged, then, that there was something less than rape which it was desired to punish. But the inconvenience in the matter was this. They were now dealing with the Criminal Law, and presumably knew what they meant in proposing these Amendments; but how were other people to gather what they meant when they used involved language of this sort? They first took the offence of rape, and then said there might be some other offence which did not quite amount to that, but which must be provided for; and the result would be, if this sub-section was passed, that in every case in which it was proved on the trial that the prisoner used threats or intimidation the jury would only find him guilty of a misdemeanour. Was that what was really meant? There ought, for goodness sake, to be some attempt to make the law consistent, reasonable, and clear. It was all very well to say they had a legal authority of high standing in "another place" to assist in drawing the Bill; but that legal authority was not here. If they had him here he might possibly be converted, for there was no more candid man alive than Lord Bramwell. The clause as it stood was involved and mischievous. If they chose to make it a little more precise in its definition, well and good; it then might be made to say that on a trial for rape the jury might take a view similar to that expressed by the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt), and find the prisoner guilty, not of rape, but of something less, which ought to be punished if the crime of rape could not be established. If the jury thought the milder offence was proved, but not the heavier one, they should be at liberty to convict of the milder offence. He (Mr. Hopwood) would not resist a provision of that sort. But if the clause were passed as it stood, he knew what the effect would be—that the jury in all these cases would jump to the conclusion that only the milder form of the offence had been made out. That might not, perhaps, be a bad thing in itself; but it was not quite in the direction of the severe Code which they were supposed to be trying to set up.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT wished to state exactly what he regarded as the central feature of this clause. There was a form of intimidation which was not only, technically, in law a rape, but it would be held to be rape by any jury who tried the case, and in such a case the indictment ought to be for rape. If a man held a loaded pistol to a woman's head, and said, "Unless you submit I will shoot you," that would be, unquestionably, a rape. But he would give another illustration of what he did not think—and he owned that his opinion on the matter was not of any great weight—would amount to rape, and no jury would convict a man of rape in such a case. Suppose a man had had connection with a woman before she was married, and the woman afterwards married another man, and the first man wished to have possession of her again, and said to her—"Unless you come to my house to-night and submit to me, I will inform your husband as to what were our relations before your marriage." That was not rape—no jury would find it so; but was it a thing which was not to be punished? Were they to let one act of intimidation go scot free because another act of intimidation actually amounted to rape? That was really the whole case. It was said that such a provision would throw confusion into the Criminal Law. Not at all. The person prosecuted would be dealt with according to the facts of the case. If the man was guilty of the first class of intimidation, he would be indicted for rape; if for the second class, he would be indicted under this clause; and the clause would be totally insufficient unless it was adopted in this form?

MR. EDWARD CLARKE said, he was very sorry that they had not heard from the Attorney General a proposal to substantially modify or else to abandon the clause, for it was outside the scope and purpose of the Bill, and would introduce a new offence of a most dangerous kind into their Criminal Law. He quite agreed with the right hon. Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) that violent intimidation and threats might constitute rape, and the whole question was for the jury whether the girl consented or not. If there was violence which so overwhelmed her mind that she submitted without consent, that was rape. But the illustration which the right hon. Gentleman gave on the previous night was the case of a girl being induced to consent to surrender herself without resistance to her seducer on his saying that he would dismiss her father from his situation, or give some information to somebody about her own loss of virtue. But a case of that kind was not a matter which that House would ever protect by its laws. If such a law were passed, the result would be that where it was discovered that a girl had had illicit connection with a man she would say—"It is true I submitted myself, and accompanied him to a place where he took possession of my person, and that I made no resistance; but then he told me that if I did not allow him to do what he wished, he would tell stories about me, or get me dismissed, or my father dismissed." That was an accusation which no man could combat or defend himself against—an accusation which there was not the least occasion in this Bill for the first time to turn into a crime. There was no difficulty about the matter. If the clause were passed, that which had hitherto been a rape by Common Law would still be a rape, although it might come in the category described by the clause; but the real effect of the clause would be to enlarge the Criminal Law by making that a crime in future which had not been a crime hitherto, and which, as he believed, there was no necessity at all for making into a crime. It would be a crime the accusation of which it would be impossible for people to defend themselves from. Under those circumstances, and as it had nothing to do with the protection of women or children, it would be far wiser for the Committee to hold by the law as it had existed for so many years, and not extend it in the way proposed. The law of false representation and pretences was an entirely different matter. So long ago as the fifth year of this Reign, the late Bishop Wilberforce succeeded in passing that into law. He (Mr. Clarke) did not know that there had been any indictment under it; but there it was, and perhaps it was as well that it should be left on the Statute Book. He hoped the Committee would not dangerously undertake to enlarge the law in the manner now proposed.

Mr. WEST said, he thought there was a deficiency in the law which ought to be remedied. He had frequently heard, as other hon. Members must have done, cases where a girl had resisted with her whole strength up to a certain point, and then, overcome partly by fear and partly by threats, had given way, and submitted to be ravished, and because she had not resisted to the end the prisoner had been acquitted. It had been said that a threat or intimidation might amount to rape; but such a case was very rare, as such threat or intimidation must be of such a character as to deprive a woman of her power of resistance. He was so anxious that the Bill should pass as speedily as possible that he would not propose any Amendment; but he quite agreed with the observation of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) that the clause should be amended in this particular—that, as in many other criminal cases, it should be enacted that upon a trial for rape it might be permitted to the jury to find the prisoner guilty of a misdemeanour. That was a well-known enactment in many Acts of Parliament; and he thought that if this clause were so altered it would be considerably improved, and would become a very valuable provision for protecting many women who were not protected as the law stood at present.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, the reason why he had not risen before to-night was because he expressed his view of this particular point as thoroughly as he possibly could on the previous evening. As to the views advanced by the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) and the hon. and learned Member for Plymouth (Mr. Clarke), he had never contended that there might not be threats and intimidation which amounted to rape. He was glad to find that two hon. and learned Members whose opinions on the Criminal Law were so much more valuable than his own had repeated the law as he laid it down last night. The hon. and learned Member for Plymouth agreed with him that if the offence now aimed at was to be punished, it was an offence which did not amount to rape—that there were, in fact, offences of this nature which were not covered by the law of rape. The simple question was whether they were offences which ought to come within the law or not. He thought they should; and he asked the Committee to declare that they ought to be admitted to the Criminal Law.

Mr. HOPWOOD wished to know how this point could be got over, that where a man was indicted for rape it might be urged that it was procured by threats and intimidation, and a reference to this Statute would be made to show that it was a misdemeanour, and thereupon the Judge would be obliged to acquit the prisoner of the charge of rape?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, the safest and the simplest way would be to insert words to meet the case.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. Assheton Cross) suggested that the necessary Amendment might be made in Clause 8.

MR. HOPWOOD said, that under those circumstances he would withdraw his Amendment.

MR. WARTON said, the question of consent was for the jury to determine—it was for them to say whether the girl had submitted under threats or not. He threw aside all refining arguments about the extent of the intimidation—the real question was whether the woman consented or not. He protested most strongly against putting these words in. He knew the learned Attorney General was distinguished in all other branches of the law except the Criminal Law; and he would ask him whether he would assent to the introduction of some words in the first line of the sub-section to the effect that the offence of intimidation did not amount to rape, or whether it would be wiser to omit the sub-section altogether, and leave to Clause 8 the consideration of what did and what did not amount to rape? He (Mr. Warton) was not going to be bound down by authority; and he would say that whoever drew up the clause, even though it was Lord Bramwell himself, had mixed up three or four things which ought to have been kept separate.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, he had no wish to keep up the discussion; but he was bound to say that he was not satisfied with the explanation of the clause which had been given. It was a case of rape or no rape, and in order to punish rape there must be such an overpowering of the will of the woman as to leave her no alternative but absolute submission. They might draw the line as finely as they could about the precise degree of intimidation, but it would be of very little use. It was a great many years since he had been in a Criminal Court; but his recollection was that it was a matter of extreme difficulty to procure a conviction in cases of rape upon adults. The right hon. Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) had put two cases to the Committee—one, the case of a threat by a paramour; the other, the case of a threat to discharge the girl or her father from a situation. But no jury would give a conviction in cases of that kind, because they would not consider that the influence on the mind of the person who submitted was of that nature which was necessary to constitute crime on the part of the assailant. In a case of rape it would be necessary to show that the will of the person who submitted had been completely overcome and overpowered. He, therefore, ventured to submit to his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General that the wording of the clause should be so amended as to make the crime consist, not in the success of the person charged in having overcome the woman, but in the threat and intimidation; and he would suggest that these words should be inserted—

> "Any person who shall threaten or who shall use intimidation in order to procure any woman or girl to have unlawful connection shall be guilty of a misdemeanour."

That would make the threat, and not its success, the offence. Such an alteration would cover the cases mentioned by the right hon. Member for Derby. If necessary, he (Mr. Serjeant Simon) would himself propose an Amendment to that effect; but in the meanwhile he merely threw out the suggestion to see whether the hon. and learned Attorney General would be willing to adopt it.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he quite admitted that there were threats and intimidation which would constitute rape; but there were threats and intimidation which would not, and the question was whether the latter should go without punishment. He was not prepared, therefore, to accept the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, he would now propose the Amendment which he had just mentioned, the object of which was to make it an offence to threaten or to use intimidation for the purpose of obtaining the woman's consent. He proposed to strike out the words "by threats or intimidation procures or endeavours to procure," in order to insert the words "any person who shall threaten to use intimidation in order to procure," &c.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 22, to leave out the words "by threats or intimidation procures or endeavours," in order to insert the words "shall threaten to use intimidation in order."—(*Mr. Serjeant Simon.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the sub-section."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he was sure that his hon. and learned Friend would be sorry to take up the time of the Committee unnecessarily. The words, however, "by threats or intimidation procures or endeavours to procure" were in the clause already, and always had been, and they entirely covered the Amendment of his hon. and learned Friend. In point of fact, the words of the sub-section, as they stood, were stronger than those proposed in the Amendment. As a matter of fact, his hon. and learned Friend proposed to leave only the threats, without touching the result produced by those threats.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, that if his Amendment were adopted the words "to procure unlawful connection" would still remain; and it was because he believed that the clause would otherwise be a failure that he proposed to make the threat to procure an offence. He believed that that was the only way of giving real life and effect to the clause.

MR. FLOYER said, he was inclined to agree with the hon. and learned Member. He thought it was very important to keep the two classes of offence —rape and procuring—perfectly distinct from each other. In the one case, where threats only were used, and by those threats unlawful connection was brought about, everybody would understand that that was a rape, and, therefore, punishable with a higher sentence. But what they now wanted to secure was that if a person should endeavour by threats to procure either by himself, or any other person, unlawful connection, and connection did not follow, that that should be a punishable offence also. He understood that the Amendment, if adopted, would punish the offence of using threats, and in that way two distinct offences would be created. The higher offence was already punishable, and it ought to be kept quite distinct from the minor offence. He thought that the object of the hon. and learned Gentleman was a very good one, and so far as he understood it at the present moment he should certainly support it.

MR. WARTON agreed with the hon. and learned Gentleman in the object of his Amendment, but not as to the way in which he proposed to carry it out.

Amendment *negatived.*

CAPTAIN PRICE wished to ask the ruling of the Chair whether the word "threats" now stood part of the sub-section or not?

THE CHAIRMAN replied in the affirmative.

CAPTAIN PRICE said, he would move then the omission of the word "threats" in order to substitute the words "fraudulent means." His object was to simplify the clause, and to make it an offence for any person who "by fraudulent means or intimidation procures." He hoped the Committee would accept the Amendment, because, if it were adopted, he thought it might be possible to leave out Sub-sections 2 and 3 altogether. It must be quite clear that the word "intimidation" covered the word "threats." Anyone who used threats must be said to intimidate. He did not know whether there was any subtle distinction in the legal mind between the two terms, but he wanted to make it perfectly clear; and, therefore, he proposed to leave out the word "threats." In the 2nd sub-section false pretences and false representations were included in the words "fraudulent means." In fact, it was apparent that that must be the object of the framer of the Bill, because the sub-section said "false pretences, false representations, or other fraudulent means," clearly showing that both were considered to be a species of fraudulent means.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 22, to leave out the word "threats," and insert the words "fraudulent means."—(*Captain Price.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'threats' stand part of the sub-section."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, that as this Amendment had been practically discussed for several hours on a previous evening, he hoped the word "threats" would be allowed to stand. He quite sympathized with the object of his hon. and gallant Friend in desiring to simplify the clause, and the second Amendment on the Paper was one in his own name, in which he proposed to insert, after "intimidation," the words—

"Or by false pretences, false representations, or other fraudulent means,"

with a view of moving afterwards the omission of Sub-sections 2 and 3. The reason why the words "fraudulent representations" were inserted, as well as "fraudulent means," was that they already appeared in an existing Statute, and therefore it was desirable to retain the same words in this instance.

MR. M'COAN wished to ask a question with regard to the words in line 23. The sub-section read—

"By threats or intimidation procures, or endeavours to procure, any woman or girl to have unlawful carnal connection."

He had carefully studied the provisions of the Bill during the last fortnight or three weeks; but he failed to understand what was meant by the phrase "unlawful carnal connection," because the carnal connection, in order to be punishable, must be unlawful, illicit connection not being unlawful in itself. He wished to know whether there was any special meaning attached to the word "unlawful?"

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, the words which appeared in the clause were words which were used in the old Statute, and they were thoroughly and perfectly well understood. For that reason they had been retained in the present Bill.

Amendment *negatived.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he would now propose the Amendment to which he had just referred—namely, to insert, after "intimidation, the words—

"False pretences, false representations, or other fraudulent means."

His object in proposing the Amendment was to put the three sub-sections into one. As they stood at present, they rendered the clause absolute nonsense, and the object of the Amendment was to simplify it.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 22, after the word "intimidation," to insert the words "or by false pretences, false representations, or other fraudulent means."—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. GREGORY pointed out that there was a Proviso to the 2nd subsection providing that it should not apply where the woman or girl knew that the connection brought about by means of false pretences, false representations, or other fraudulent means, was unlawful. There was also a distinction in the two offences defined by the 1st and 2nd sub-section. The 1st sub-section made any person punishable who, by threats or intimidation, procured, or endeavoured to procure; while the 2nd sub-section made it a punishable offence for any person, by false pretences, false representations, or other fraudulent means, to procure.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he thought that the whole case was covered by the words he proposed to insert, which provided that it should be punishable for any person, by threats or intimidation, or by false pretences, false representations, or other fraudulent means, to procure, or endeavour to procure.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he had some difficulty in knowing what was actually going on in the Committee. So far as he could understand, it was proposed to make the offence of endeavouring to procure a punishable offence; but it would leave the offence of procuring untouched. ["No!"] That only showed the difficulty of knowing what was going on. He warned the Committee that it could make no difference whether fraudulent means, or false pretences, or false representations were used, so long as the person principally interested was not deceived.

MR. EDWARD CLARKE said, that before the Amendment was accepted, the Committee ought to know that the effect of it would be to repeal the 49th section of 24 & 25 *Vict.* That section, which had been in operation for many years, limited the age of a person upon whom false representation could be imposed to 21 years; and the effect of the alteration now proposed was to repeal that limitation of 21 years, and to strike out the clause from the Act of Parliament, 24 & 25 *Vict.* He confessed his own opinion was that when they had a clause already in operation in an existing Statute, and which had been in operation for a considerable time, it would be a great pity to repeal it in order to substitute something that was substantially the same in a new Act. He thought it would be far better to leave the old Act in force.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, it was quite true that there was a clause to that effect in the 49th section of 24 & 25 *Vict.*, making it an offence to procure improper connection with a woman under 21 years of age by threats. It was now proposed to add to the offence intimidation; and he did not see why procuring by means of false representation should not be an offence in regard to a woman of 25 or 30, as well as to one under 21 years of age. In all other respects the existing law would remain. He thought that the proposals of the Home Secretary were right, and he hoped the Committee would adopt them.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he would like to know precisely what those words meant. For instance, supposing a man were to promise a woman £100, which, in the case of a Member of that House, would probably not be considered very much, and then were only to give her £50, the question might be raised whether, in such a case, there had not been a fraudulent pretence.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, that the words "fraudulent pretence" were very well understood in law by those who administered an Act of Parliament. He seldom differed from his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Plymouth (Mr. Clarke) in regard to a matter of Criminal Law; but in this instance he could not quite agree with his hon. and learned Friend, who expressed his disinclination to repeal a section of an old Act of Parliament, in order to put it into a new one. He (the Attorney General) thought it would be more convenient to repeal the section of the existing law, and to place it in the new Act. Sometimes a difficulty arose from having a number of sections contained in different Acts of Parliament; and it was much better, when they clearly knew what they intended to do, to put the section in a new Act.

Mr. LYULPH STANLEY said, he thought that this Amendment, coupled with the observation of the Home Secretary, that he intended to propose the omission of Sections 2 and 3, made the proposal a somewhat dangerous and difficult one. The Proviso, as it stood, enacted that where a woman consented, no matter by what means that consent was brought about, the false pretence was not to apply; but it was now proposed that where a woman was induced to consent by false pretences, false representations, or other fraudulent means, although she knew perfectly well what it was she was consenting to, the clause should apply. As he read the Proviso and the clause together, it made it punishable for any deception to be resorted to, like a mock marriage, or something of that kind, where a woman was induced to sacrifice her virtue by means of fraud or deceit; and any man who took advantage of such false representation or deceit to obtain connection with a woman who was not married to him would, on conviction, be liable to imprisonment for two years. It was all very well to say that the words proposed to be added in reference to fraudulent pretences and fraudulent representations occurred in an existing Act of Parliament; but he was not aware—and perhaps some Member of the Government would inform him if it was so—that any judicial interpretation of those words had been given, or whether any case had been decided. He knew that in the ordinary Criminal Law the obtaining of goods by false pretences was open to a variety of interpretations; and knowing that fraudulent means and fraudulent devices were liable to be interpreted in an extremely wide sense, he wished to know how those words were likely to be construed in this particular instance? Would conspiracy, for instance, be construed in the same manner as an ordinary indictment for false pretences? The case put by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) would not be one of ordinary false pretences, but was a promise of something in the future which was not performed in its entirety. Was it intended under the clause that a man who promised marriage to a woman, and by that promise secured possession of her, if he did not afterwards marry her, might be accused of having obtained possession of her by fraudulent means? That was a very serious point, for he believed that in this country it had not been uncommon to obtain possession of a woman under promise of marriage. Was it to be set up that in such cases, in future, there would be the prospect of an indictment for procuring a woman under false pretences, false representations, or other fraudulent means? He thought there ought to be some illustration given to show what kind of false pretences would be punishable. It would be too much for a woman to induce a man knowingly and willingly to go with her, and then to turn round and give him two years' imprisonment on the charge that she had been influenced by the false representations made to her. He thought that would be carrying the Criminal Law to a dangerous length.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he entirely agreed with the observations of the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. He saw great danger in the clause, especially as there was to be no limitation in regard to age. He also concurred entirely with the view of the hon. and learned Member for Plymouth (Mr. Clarke). When the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) asked what fraudulent pretences meant, the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General gave a very vague and indefinite answer. He simply referred to some provisions in other Acts of Parliament; but he did not inform the Committee that they were in any way analogous to the clause it was now proposed to insert. He could not, for the life of him, understand why, if a man obtained possession of a certain thing on the promise to pay a certain sum of money, and then did not pay the whole of it, he should be found guilty of having made a fraudulent representation. The case of a mock marriage instanced by the hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Lyulph Stanley) was one that was quite to the point; and he (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) would add another which had been brought to his recollection by an observation which had been made by the right hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James). He referred to the case of marrying a deceased wife's sister. It certainly appeared to him that if they passed this clause every man who married his wife's sister would run the risk of being tried for misdemeanour. He had supported the validity of such marriages ever since he had had the honour of a seat in that House. He believed that a large number of such marriages were contracted by women who did not know that they were in every way illegal; and the adoption of this clause, in its present shape, might affect the persons who contracted such marriages, not only whether they were contracted in England, but abroad. He knew that there were many cases where a man who desired to marry his deceased wife's sister, and knowing that he could not be legally married in England, thought that by going to another country where such a marriage was not unlawful he rendered it legal so far as this country was concerned. Of course, that was done in ignorance of the law; but marriages of that kind did take place abroad, and, having been consummated, the persons who had contracted them came back to England, when the woman found that, according to the law of England, she was no longer her brother-in-law's wife. In such a case, would it be held that he had obtained possession of her person by fraudulent misrepresentations? He recollected a case which came under his cognizance a few years ago, where a highly respectable Roman Catholic priest discovered that he had rendered himself liable to a charge of felony by having performed the marriage ceremony in one of these cases, and when the Registrar was not present. It might not be known to all Members of the House that marriage with a deceased wife's sister, in the event of certain formalities being complied with, were valid in the Roman Catholic Church. If a man was desirous of contracting a marriage with his deceased wife's sister, and was told that he could not do so lawfully, he had only to go to his priest, and, having obtained the formality of a dispensation, the marriage, according to the regulations of the Roman Catholic Church, was lawful. A woman, therefore, under such circumstances, would be induced to believe that on receiving a dispensation the marriage was perfectly lawful, and that she was the genuine wife of her brother-in-law. But, under this clause, if the brother-in-law discarded her, as he would be entitled to do, seeing that the marriage, according to the law of the land, was unlawful, he might find that he had placed himself in a position to be indicted for the criminal offence of misdemeanour. At present the law limited the age at which a woman could be deceived by fraudulent representations to 21 years; and he was astonished to hear a man of the experience of the right hon. Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) declare that the age of the women made no difference, but that the provisions of the law ought to be extended, no matter what the age was. Surely the right hon. Gentleman knew that there were constant instances of extortion where a woman sought to obtain money by bringing charges of an improper character against a man. Almost every day cases of that kind were to be found in the newspapers. Not more than three days ago he saw a report of the case of a woman of 17 years of age who was tried at the Durham Assizes on seven distinct charges of extortion. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary talked about the purity of their homes being invaded; but he would ask the right hon. Gentleman how he regarded that question in reference to the male sex? Were they to have no care of their young men? By raising the age of protection for women, were they to throw the door open to every species of extortion against young men? He failed to see why they should extend the present limit of 21 years. He had certainly heard no serious objection to that limit being retained.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, he thought the Committee ought to bear in mind two things—namely, the offence with which they were dealing, and the necessity of giving no facility for trumping up false charges. This sub-section, as had been pointed out, was nothing but the re-enactment of the 49th section of 24 & 25 *Vict.*, except in regard to the limit of age. The clause, as it stood, contained a Proviso in Sub-sections 2 and 3, which took away the benefits of the old Statute of 24 & 25 *Vict.* as to age. Therefore, in extending the limit of age it was desirable, on various grounds, to prevent, as far as possible, the possibility of false charges being made. Under the words "false representations or other fraudulent means," if a designing woman were prepared to say "the man promised to give me 20*s.* and only gave me 10*s.*; and that was all he had to give me," that would be a false representation. It was necessary for the Committee to see that they had to steer their course between two difficulties; and he would ask the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill, inasmuch as he understood the right hon. Gentleman intended to move to strike out the Proviso in Sub-sections 2 and 3, if it would not meet the difficulty, to some extent, by saying that those two sub-sections should not apply to women of known immoral character? [Sir R. Assheton Cross replied in the affirmative.] If that were so, the man would be protected from any false charge made by a woman of known immoral character. He did not know that that would meet the difficulty altogether; but he thought it would meet the danger of those false charges being made.

Mr. EDWARD CLARKE said, he was glad to hear from the late Attorney General the suggestion that the Committee should, to some extent, modify what might be a dangerous course in the matter. He certainly objected to repeal old Statutes in order to put them into new ones. The Act of 24 & 25 *Vict.*, c. 100, was an Act to consolidate the Statute Law of England and Ireland relating to acts against the person. It was proposed to repeal the 49th section of that Act, and supplement the Code by inserting the present clause in the Bill; but he did not see why they should take a section out of that Statute, repeal it, and then put it into another Statute. So far as false pretences was concerned, he saw no reason why there should be any limitation of age. A man might just as reasonably impose upon a woman of 30 as upon a girl of 15; but the difficulty was in rendering a young man liable to two years' imprisonment if he coerced a woman of 30, who was certainly not likely to be overawed by any menace or representation a youth might make. The result might be that a woman who willingly gave herself to the embraces of a man might afterwards come forward and say that she had done so in consequence of having been intimidated. Of course, there would not be much danger in the case of women of known immoral character; but the danger would arise in dealing with women whose previous immorality could not be proved.

Mr. R. T. REID remarked, that the words "false representations, false pretences, and other fraudulent means," were taken from the Act of 1860, and they were perfectly well understood. He did not understand, for a moment, that the case which had been suggested by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) of offering a particular sum of money, and then paying less, would afford any ground for an indictment under this section. He therefore failed to see what practical object would be attained by adopting the suggestion of the late Attorney General (Sir Henry James).

Mr. GREGORY was of opinion that something should be done to prevent extortion on the part of persons of immoral character. He was, therefore, of opinion that the clause should give protection to all whom it was desirable to protect within the scope of the Bill. If a man had connection with a woman under a promise of marrying her, and it turned out afterwards that he was married, was that to be considered a fraudulent pretence?

Mr. LABOUCHERE wished to know if the late Attorney General intended to move the Amendment he had suggested? They were told by the present Attorney General that the words "fraudulent means" could not in any sense apply to the offering of a certain sum to a woman, and then not giving it to her. As a layman, he (Mr. Labouchere) was certainly not acquainted with the refinements of the law; but he understood that that was exactly the reverse of the view which had been expressed by the present Attorney General. He was afraid that a great deal of black mail might be levied unless the proposal of the right hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James) were accepted, and he hoped the Committee would divide upon it.

Amendment *agreed to.*

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) moved, in page 1, line 22, to leave out the word "endeavours," in order to insert the word "attempts."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Captain PRICE said, he had an Amendment on the Paper in the next line of this sub-section to insert after "girl" the words—

> "Not being a common prostitute or person of known immoral character."

He proposed to insert those words for the reason given by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) and the late Attorney General. The Amendment would deal with the case of a man who, accosting a prostitute who had no wish to have anything to say to him, succeeded in overcoming her scruples by offering her £5, and then only gave her £1. He was afraid that by the clause as it stood that might be held to be false pretences.

Amendment proposed,

> In page 1, line 33, after the word "girl," to insert the words "not being a common prostitute or person of known immoral character."—(*Captain Price.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he could not accept the Amendment. In the first instance, the effect would be to alter Section 49 of the Act 24 & 25 *Vict.*, and, therefore, to change the existing law. Why should a woman—even although she was a woman of loose character—be subjected to intimidation and violence against her will? The existing law protected her, and he saw no reason why the law should be altered.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, he understood the object of the present Bill was to prevent defilement, which was entirely opposed to the notion of dealing with common women in any sense. He thought the fault rested with the words in the clause, which were not altogether applicable to the offence the clause was intended to deal with. The terms—

> "False pretences, false representations, or other fraudulent means,"

were very wide, and would afford an opportunity to women to trump up cases. In cases of breach of promise, in future the woman would only have to bring forward a charge of this kind to enable her counsel to ask for very substantial damages, and to suggest that this measure had been placed at the woman's disposal for that very purpose. The law with regard to "fraudulent devices" had never yet been judicially expounded, and no lawyer he had ever met with could give an instance of a case in which the old Act had been put in force.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, he had suggested that Sub-sections 2 and 3 should not apply to women of immoral character. They were not dealing now with threats and intimidation only, but also with false representations, false pretences, and other fraudulent means, which might mean not representing falsely a fact, but something that was to come hereafter. What was it that the Committee were engaged in doing? They were aiming the Bill indirectly at prostitution; and if they did not accept these words they were favouring prostitution. He did not see why a prostitute should not be protected by law in regard to such rights as she had; but by employing the words "false representations" they were going beyond the law, and might drive a man into a police court and ruin his future prospects for life unnecessarily. The present law did not go beyond the protection of women under 21 years of age; but they were now extending this protection to a much larger class of women, and were giving them an opportunity of making false charges for purposes of extortion. He really felt that this was a matter which ought to be carefully considered, and he would ask the Government to allow an Amendment to be brought up in a different form on the Report.

Mr. JAMES STUART strongly objected to so much being left over for Report. There was yet ample time for arguing the matter. He appealed to the Home Secretary to retain the clause without the addition now proposed.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON said, the clause as it stood would not carry out the views of the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Stuart); and he thought they might extend the protection even beyond what the right hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James) suggested. The right hon. and learned Gentleman instanced the case of a man who promised £1 and only gave 10*s*. A man in such a case as that ought certainly to be protected against being prosecuted for procuring the commission of an unlawful act under false pretences. Were they going to protect any woman who sold herself for money, and who did not happen to belong to that class of women known as prostitutes? Take the case of a woman who sold herself for £100, and only received £50. Was that the class of woman, whether she was of known immoral character or not, that they wished to protect? His opinion was that they only desired to protect virtue and morality, and they ought to define fraudulent means so as to exclude all cases of the promise of money. It would not be sufficient to confine the matter simply to street walkers; no woman who sold herself for a promise of money should be able to take advantage of this clause in the event of the man not paying her as much as she expected. He would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill that he should put in the Interpretation Clause some Proviso limiting the words "fraudulent means," and excluding all cases in which a promise of money or reward of any kind was made.

Captain PRICE said, he would not press the Amendment; but he wished to ask the Government if they would bring up on the Report, or move now, a Proviso to the sub-section to this effect—

"That the sub-section should not apply to any woman or girl being a common prostitute, or a person of known immoral character."

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK moved, after the word "girl," to insert "under the age of 21 years," which would have the effect of limiting the protection afforded by the sub-section to any woman or girl under 21 years of age. If he received any assurance from his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General that some such words would be introduced by the Government in accordance with the suggestion which had been made by his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Devonport (Captain Price) and by the right hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James) he would not insist upon the Amendment; but otherwise he should be compelled to do so.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 23, after the word "girl," to insert the words "under the age of twenty-one years."—(*Mr. Cavendish Bentinck.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he proposed to agree to the insertion of some such words.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) moved, in page 1, line 23, to leave out the word "unlawful."

Amendment *agreed to.*

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) moved the omission of the following sub-sections:—

"(2.) By false pretences, false representations, or other fraudulent means, procures any woman or girl to have unlawful carnal connexion, either within or without the Queen's dominions, with himself or any other man: Provided that this sub-section shall not apply where such woman or girl knew such connection to be unlawful; or

"(3.) By false pretences, false representations, or other fraudulent means, endeavours to procure any woman or girl to have unlawful carnal connection, either within or without the Queen's dominions, with himself or any other man: Provided that this sub-section shall not apply where such woman or girl knew this connexion to be unlawful."

He proposed to strike out those sub-sections altogether, because the effect of them had already been introduced into the 1st sub-section, and he presumed that the Amendments which appeared on the Paper in reference to those paragraphs would practically disappear.

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 26, to leave out Sub-sections (2) and (3).—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, that that course having been taken, he proposed to move the omission of the 4th sub-section, which read as follows:—

"(4.) Induces a girl under the age of twenty-one years, with intent that she shall have unlawful carnal connection with himself or any other man, to enter a brothel, she not knowing the same to be a brothel nor being a party to the intent."

MR. M'COAN said, the right hon. Gentleman had omitted to notice that he had placed an Amendment on the Paper for the insertion of a sub-section after the 1st sub-section to include any person who

"Procures, or endeavours to procure, any woman or girl, not being a common prostitute, when under the influence of any intoxicating liquor, opiate, or narcotic, to have unlawful carnal connection with himself or any other man."

In framing that Amendment he had certainly entertained some doubt whether the offence he proposed to deal with did not really amount to rape. In that case it might not be properly dealt with by a new Proviso which reduced the offence to one of misdemeanour. He was, however, encouraged to persevere with his Amendment, because he saw that there were two Amendments on the Paper to a similar effect in the name of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon), and the Home Secretary also proposed to deal with it himself. He believed that it was an offence to administer drugs; but it was not an offence to have improper connection with a woman when she was under the influence of the drug. He, therefore, thought that the Bill would be improved by that being made a distinct offence.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) opposed the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) proposed the omission of Sub-section 4, on the ground that it amounted to a fraud which had already been dealt with.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, to omit Sub-section (4).—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Question proposed, "That Sub-section (4) stand part of the Bill."

MR. STANSFELD remarked that he had an Amendment on this sub-section, and if it were omitted it would be necessary that he should move his Amendment in the form of a new sub-section.

Amendment *agreed to.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) moved the insertion of a new sub-section to follow Sub-section (1), the effect of which was to make it a misdemeanour to apply, administer to, or cause to be taken away by any woman or girl any stupefying or overpowering drug, matter, or thing, with intent thereby to enable himself or any man to have unlawful connection with such woman or girl.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 14, after the word "intent," to insert—"(5.) Applies, administers to, or causes to be taken by any woman or girl any stupefying or overpowering drug, matter, or thing, with intent thereby to enable himself or any man to have unlawful connection with such woman or girl."—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HOPWOOD said, he thought the Committee were entitled to some explanation of the necessity of this sub-section. It was asserted that in this country it was possible to do these things, and that the law could not touch the offender. He maintained that the offence was touched by the existing law in various ways. In the first place, if anybody were to get possession of a woman by means of administering a stupefying or overpowering drug, the woman being reduced thereby to a state of insensibility, or wanting the power to express her will in regard to the act, it was rape. Then, in addition to that, there was an Act of Parliament in existence which declared that any person who administered chloroform, or a drug or opiate, or any other matter or thing to anybody with the intent to commit a felony, was guilty of a felony, and was already punishable by law. There were a good many mystifications in the Bill throughout, and there were repetitions of a good deal that was already law. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give some good reason why it was necessary to insert this sub-section. The word "intent" was precisely the same as the word "attempt" in the Criminal Law. If a man gave a woman a glass of grog, or a pinch of snuff, or anything else with the intention to commit a rape, he maintained that that was an attempt to commit a felonious act, and was already dealt with by the law. He asked the right hon. Gentleman, therefore, to say what reason he had for believing that these cases were not already sufficiently dealt with by the existing law.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, the real question with regard to this Amendment of his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary was whether or not it went beyond the existing law. They were all of one mind—that it was undesirable to include in the Bill a number of superfluous provisions; but it would appear, from Mr. Justice Stephen's *Digest of Law*, that the law, as it stood, dealt with cases where there was an intent to assist or enable any other person to commit an indictable offence, or an attempt to render any person insensible or unconscious by administering any overpowering drug. As the law now stood, that applied only to persons who assisted another to commit an indictable offence; and, so far as rape was concerned, that was a case which was also dealt with. The Amendment, however, of his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary went further. In the first place, there was no limit of age; and, in the next place, it made it a misdemeanour for any person to administer to any woman or girl any stupefying or overpowering drug with the intent to enable any other person to have unlawful connection with such woman or girl. There were cases which might not amount to a rape; and if something were done by a third person, or by anybody in connection with a third person, which led to the commission of an offence, he maintained that it was a matter which ought to be brought within the Criminal Law. He quite recognized, with his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood), that the existing law dealt with these offences to a certain extent; but it did not go as far as his right hon. Friend proposed to go.

Mr. M'COAN said, he was not satisfied that this Amendment would meet the whole of the case. The Act of 1860 went much further than the proposed Amendment, and was much more comprehensive; but even the provisions of that Act did not, to his mind, grapple with all the difficulties of the case.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) remarked that that Act was not repealed.

Mr. M'COAN said, that, as he read the Amendment, it provided for the punishment of the person who administered a drug, but not for the person who committed the offence of violating the woman who was the victim of the drug. It might be that connection with a woman under the influence of a drug would be held to be rape; but there might also be degrees of unconsciousness produced by the administration of a drug which would not be held to be rape. He would instance the case of a half-drunken woman, neither drunk nor sober, to whom improper overtures were made, and followed up by the commission of an unlawful act. That would not be held to be rape, and yet a morally criminal offence would have been committed. The Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman would not meet that case. It did not punish a man who profited by the administration of the drug, but only the man who administered it. He should be glad if, by any alteration in the wording of the sub-section, the case he had pointed out could be met; because he certainly thought that, as it was at present drawn, it would have very little effect, and he should be glad to see it made quite perfect.

Mr. STANSFELD said, that his objection to the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman was that it did not cover every case. For instance, it left out the administration of intoxicating drinks.

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, there was one observation which had fallen from the Attorney General which he thought was worthy of consideration. His hon. and learned Friend pointed to the fact that by the Amendment it must be a stupefying or overpowering drug. He thought the words "stupefying or overpowering" restricted the operation of the clause, and that the word "drug" alone would be quite sufficient. There was another observation which he wished to make with regard to the clause as it stood at present. He wished to know if it was to apply to any person, or to any man?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER): Any person.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT disagreed with his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Christchurch (Mr. Horace Davey), and thought that there should be words inserted in the clause to show that the offence was to stupefy or overpower. Otherwise a man might take a woman into a public-house and give her a glass of sherry, and she might turn round upon him and accuse him of having given it to her with an unlawful intent. Unless the Committee carefully guarded these words, so as to show that it was a deliberate attempt to stupefy and overpower the will of the woman for an unlawful purpose, there was a danger that it might be used for purposes of extortion.

MR. STANSFELD suggested that it would be better to include "liquor" with "drug." The words of the Amendment would not cover all the cases which were contemplated. Nobody could say of intoxicating liquor that it was a stupefying or overpowering drug. If it were taken in excess, it might become overpowering and stupefying; but its nature was not, as was that of some drugs, to be overpowering. He thought it would be necessary to introduce some words to cover intoxicating drinks.

SIR BALDWYN LEIGHTON said, he had understood, from what the hon. and learned Attorney General said, that the clause would cover the administration of ordinary intoxicating liquors, if they were administered with an unlawful intent.

MR. STANSFELD said, his point was that the words "stupefying or overpowering drug, matter, or thing" implied that those drugs, matters, or things were in their very nature stupefying or overpowering. Now, everyone knew that that was not the case with intoxicants, because taken to a moderate extent they did not overpower or stupefy, but, on the contrary, they stimulated. Let the Committee remember what followed. It was always understood that the drug, matter, or thing, was administered with intent, &c. He therefore put it before the Committee that whenever intoxicating liquor should be administered to a woman or girl with that intent, the person who so administered it ought to bear the punishment provided by the clause. He should, therefore, move an Amendment to the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman (Sir R. Assheton Cross) which would meet the case of administering intoxicating liquors.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, in line 2, after the word "thing," to insert the words "or intoxicating liquor."—(*Mr. Stansfeld.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, if the Amendment proposed by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Stansfeld) were adopted, the giving of one glass of sherry would be sufficient. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman to the extent that the thing need not be in its nature stupefying or overpowering, but that it should be so in its effect. But that he denied was the meaning of the words as they stood. They might put in "any drug, matter, or thing to the extent of stupefying or overpowering," or words that would mean that the thing must be given to the extent that would produce stupefaction or overpowering.

MR. R. T. REID suggested that the words "to an extent which causes any woman or girl to become intoxicated" should be added.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he thought the more sensible course would be to take the words suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), and say "any drug, matter, or thing so as to stupefy or overpower."

MR. COURTNEY said, he understood that the proposal was to withdraw the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld), in order to insert the words suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt). He pointed out that those words would only apply where something had been given or administered to an extent that caused the subject to be overpowered or stupefied. So that, however wicked the intention might be, unless the thing were administered in a sufficient quantity to produce that effect the person who administered it would not come within the reach of the clause. That, he said, was reducing the clause to a nullity. What they wanted to do was to prevent the administration to any woman or girl of anything which would so derange her reasoning power as to make her become the victim of the person who administered it. He would suggest that before the words "stupefy or overpower" they should insert the words "with the intent to." That would place the meaning of the clause in a clear light, whereas he thought that the wording recommended by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby would leave the matter so vague that the application of this portion of the Act would be made impracticable.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, he ventured to think that the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) had suggested the proper way of dealing with this matter, by proposing words which would make it clear that the intention to stupefy or overpower, and so on, would be punished by the clause.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, to leave out "stupefying or overpowering," and insert after "intent," the words "to stupefy and overpower so as."—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Defilement of girl between twelve and fifteen years of age).

Mr. THOMASSON said, he would ask for an explanation of the term "unlawfully" used in this clause.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, it had been customary to describe the offence dealt with by the clause in that way. The word "unlawfully" was used in old indictments. There might have been, but he did not think that any special meaning was, attached to the word. He would point out to the Committee that the whole section was simply an expression of the law as it now existed. The clause had been paraded in some of the newspapers as if it were the introduction of new law; but it was nothing of the kind —it was simply a re-enactment of existing law.

Captain PRICE said, he did not think the existing law was strong enough on the point of age; and he rose to move that the word "twelve," in line 25, be omitted, and "thirteen" substituted. He observed that his hon. and learned Friend opposite (Mr. Serjeant Simon) had proposed to make the limit of age in this case 14 years; but he preferred his own Amendment for these reasons. He thought, on consideration of this matter, that they could not altogether eliminate the question of consent. Now, consent might be given by a girl of tender age from several motives; in the first place, it might be given because presents were offered to her, and, to some extent, because the girl did not actually know what would happen. It was obvious that the consent he had alluded to could not be held to be an excuse. But consent might be due also to natural causes, and in that case, although it would not constitute an excuse, it might be held to be something in the nature of extenuation. Up to the age of 13, which he proposed to insert in the clause, he did not think it possible that the natural cause could operate to the extent of justifying the term "consent" being applied. Therefore, for the reasons he had given, he thought the clause in respect of age did not go far enough; and, on the other hand, he considered that the Amendment of his hon. and learned Friend opposite (Mr. Serjeant Simon) went a little too far. In order to place this matter on a reasonable basis, he commended the Amendment standing in his own name to the favourable consideration of the Committee and Her Majesty's Government.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 25, to leave out the word "twelve," in order to insert the word "thirteen."—(*Captain Price.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'twelve' stand part of the Clause."

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, he had an Amendment to move which would substitute 14, as the age of the girl, for that named in the clause. This was no question of creating a new offence —it was simply a question of punishment. He would not go into the question of passion, which had been raised by the hon. and gallant Member for Devonport (Captain Price). But he would point out that there was this distinction between the felony and misdemeanour—that in the former the female was immature, both in body and mind, and the man guilty of it must be of brutal nature. He believed, even at the age of 15, a girl was not always able to understand the consequences, because she was deficient in mind; and the same reason applied in a stronger degree to the age of 14. Although there were some females prematurely developed, yet it was no uncommon thing for development to be deferred to between the ages of 15 and 16. But at the age of 14 the girl was but a child, and he said that at that age there was neither knowledge nor passion; if there were, it was the result of unusual precocity. It was true that the conditions of life in which a large proportion of the population was placed brought young girls into contact with vice, and gave them experiences to which women of 20 in a higher class of society were strangers. So far as mental development, vice, and vicious practices were concerned, it was very well authenticated that many young girls under 12 were exposed to example and habits of the most vicious kind. But that being so, let it not be said that if a girl of 14 knew what she was about, a girl of 10 or less knew equally well. He said that they must go beyond the particular cases mentioned. He asked any hon. Member who heard him now whether, in his heart and conscience, a girl of 14 was not in respect of sensual passion a mere child, as she was not sufficiently mature in body or mind to apprehend such matters? It was not necessary for him to say that the savage who debauched a girl of that age was undeserving of any sympathy whatever, and no argument should induce them to look on him as guilty of an offence of only a venial kind—he was corrupt in heart and mind; he had committed rape, and should be dealt with by law. It had been said that there was no distinction between the ages of 12, 14, and 16. He contended that if a girl was to be protected at all, it meant that she was incapable of knowing the meaning and consequence of what was done—that was why she ought to be protected, and why the man ought to be severely punished. In the case he had put of a girl of 14 years of age, he thought the cruelty and moral viciousness of the act ought to be punished with the severest penalty which the law could inflict. He should therefore move that "fourteen" be substituted for "thirteen."

THE CHAIRMAN said, the hon. and learned Gentleman would not be in Order in moving that Amendment, because it would have the effect of altogether nullifying the Motion of the hon. and gallant Member for Devonport (Captain Price). The way to meet the Amendment of the hon. and gallant Member was to divide against it.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, in that case he would appeal to the hon. and gallant Member to withdraw his Amendment.

CAPTAIN PRICE said, in reply to the appeal of the hon. and learned Gentleman, he could only state that if his own Amendment were not passed, he should be glad to vote for the Amendment which the hon. and learned Member proposed to move.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he thought that, on the whole, they might safely take the age of 13 which stood in the clause. No doubt the age of 12 was the age recognized by the existing law, and what governed it was very much this—that it was the law of marriage in England that a boy of 14 could marry any girl of 12 years of age. The law was remarkable in that respect, because at the age of 12 binding consent could be given. If the boy were under 14, and the girl under 12, it would not be valid. Either of them on becoming of age might disagree, and the marriage might be declared void. That, he said, disposed of the question that had been raised as to the meaning of the word "unlawfully" used at the beginning of the clause. They must have that in the Act, because there was no limit of age in marriage—that was to say, if the boy and girl did not disagree the marriage would be binding. No doubt there was great difficulty in dealing with these matters, because they were dealing with ages which were recognized in the marriage law of the country. He thought the age should be taken at which a man must himself know what would be clear at the age of 12, but doubtful at the age of 13. To judge of age correctly was a matter of difficulty. When asked the other day as to the age of a girl, he found that he was wrong by two years in the judgment he formed. His opinion was that in these matters they ought not to carry the thing to an extreme; and he thought in this case they would be taking a sensible step in the direction they wished to go if they fixed the age at 13 instead of 12.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, no doubt the reason why the age of 12 was the law of England in regard to the crime dealt with in this clause was because of the law of marriage, as stated by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, and he thought they ought to be very careful in extending it. He was not unwilling to go as far as the age of 13, because a child at that age was certainly not able to have full knowledge; and, on the other hand, it must be known to anyone dealing with her that she was a child. But at 14 years of age the case was very different, and he did not think it safe to go as far as that. There did not appear to him that anything was to be gained by dwelling on this subject at great length, and he hoped the Committee would think with him that a decision should be come to with regard to it as soon as possible. It should be remembered that this clause was making the act felony, and that when the age of 12 or 13 was settled there was still the offence of misdemeanour to fall back upon.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he did not understand why they should be asked to alter the existing law. No one had shown that it was insufficient. Where were the cases between 12 and 13 years of age that had not been properly punished? He did not think that any pressing necessity had been shown for the change; certainly he thought there was none, and he believed he knew as much about the law on this subject as anyone. But someone had cried out for severity, and it was replied—"Yes. We cannot give you the whole; but we will give you the half." Hon. Gentlemen opposite spoke of the debauching of girls; but he pointed out that this section contemplated something different. The course hitherto followed in these matters was to have gradations in the law. Between the ages of 10 and 12 the offence was a misdemeanour; but, taking the law as it existed at the present time, up to 12 it was a felony. What was the argument of the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Serjeant Simon)? Why, he said, without authority, that no girl was ever mature, or anything like it, at the age of 12 or 13 years. He (Mr. Hopwood) could only contradict him with the personal observation that he himself had made. He saw many young women that he believed were not older than 13, or who, at all events, were debauched as early as 13. He supposed it was not intended that an extra punishment should be inflicted in a case of this sort—because a girl of bad character with whom a person had immoral relations happened to be a year older than the age fixed at present for the protection of young females. His hon. and learned Friend on his right (Mr. Serjeant Simon) contended that such girls were immature, and that it was impossible to suppose that such children felt passion. Why, all the evidence before them contradicted that. In evidence before the House of Lords it was stated by the chaplain of a gaol that in many cases children began a life of immorality at the early age of seven or eight years. Let them imagine the careers of those girls from the age of seven or eight to the age of 12, and remember that they were now called on, without necessity for it being shown, to attach a special punishment and a special infamy to this class of offence if the subject of it was only one year older than 12. Those who came to this subject for the first time attached enormous importance to the words, writ large, "punishment by imprisonment" staring them in the face, for this breach of the moral law. He did not. He believed that after this law was passed it would have no more effect than the old law—unless, in some few cases, it had the effect of bringing about an increase of punishment. They must remember that in all these cases the Judge would have the power of giving a small amount of punishment. The Amendment was illusory, then. What was the use of raising the point? It could only be for the sake of identifying the offence with the name which, in the olden time, was supposed to strike terror into the hearts of their forefathers — namely, "felony." They knew that a great deal of that terror had been wisely diminished, and that there was now very little difference between felony and misdemeanour. Though there might be a difference, it was a very fine one; and it seemed to him they ought not to make the change for mere change's sake.

Mr. MACARTNEY said, the section before them was for the purpose of protecting young girls, and if they did not protect them he failed to see what object they could have in view. If any hon. Gentleman knew girls of 14 who seemed to be marriageable their experience did not accord with his. No doubt there were cases amongst the lower classes where girls married at 14; but they were very few. He remembered seeing a boy of 16 who was 6 feet 2 inches high; but that was not a common occurrence. It seemed to him that their Common Law as to the period when boys and girls were marriageable was founded on the Roman Law. Well, the Romans lived in a much more Southern latitude than we, and their children—as was the case with the children of the South of France, Spain, and Italy at the present time—were much more precocious than our children. However, if he had a preference, it was for the Amendment of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Devonport (Captain Price), who proposed the age of 13. It seemed to him that that age would give much greater security. It was said that the age of puberty was between 13 and 15. The average between those ages was 14; but to avoid being unable, in many cases, to tell the difference between 13 and 14, he thought it would be wise to adopt the younger age—namely, 13.

Mr. SAMUEL MORLEY said, the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) spoke about the public calling for greater severity. Well, he believed that was precisely what the people were calling for, and he believed that the large majority of the public would sympathize with the proposal to adopt the age of 14. He (Mr. Morley) could, however, only speak for himself; and if the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) pressed the matter to a division he should support him.

Question, "That the word 'twelve' stand part of the Clause," put, and *negatived.*

Question put, "That the word 'thirteen' be there inserted."

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 76; Noes 58: Majority 18. — (Div. List, No. 261.)

Mr. H. H. FOWLER said, he wished to move an addition to the clause to place offences under the clause in the category of offences dealt with under the 26 & 27 *Vict.* c. 44, entitled—"An Act for the further securing of the persons of Her Majesty's subjects from personal violence." Under that Act, if any person committed a robbery and accompanied it with personal violence he was liable, at the discretion of the Court, to have the punishment of flogging inflicted on him; and what he (Mr. Fowler) was asking the Committee to do was to place the offence of rape on a little girl in the same category as robbery with personal violence. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood), when he made his powerful speech on the first night of this debate, had made a special reference to him (Mr. Fowler) in regard to this clause, and had seemed to think it an inconsistent and improper course in him to move it. The hon. and learned Gentleman had given, by anticipation, two reasons against the clause, one with reference to a special case which he had quoted, where great injustice had been done to a reverend gentleman named Hatch; and the other in general illustration of the administration of the law. He should like to point out to the Committee, as to the evidence of girls of tender age, and the evidence on which this punishment of flogging might be inflicted, that the case of Mr. Hatch would not be brought within this clause, and was no precedent. That was a case of indecently assaulting young girls; but the cases he was proposing to deal with were not cases of indecent assault, but cases in which the complete offence was committed—cases of felony; and, of course, no conviction would be obtained of such cases, except on medical proof that the crime had been committed. With regard to the argument of the hon. and learned Gentleman that innocent persons might be subjected to this punishment, that was an argument against all Criminal Law whatever. Innocent persons had, to the sorrow of all right-minded people, been convicted again and again. They had been sentenced to imprisonment, and had sometimes even lost their lives. But the remedy for that, if it were owing, in any way, to the unsatisfactory state of their law, was not the relaxation of punishment for gross crimes, but rather the establishment of a Court of Criminal Appeal, which he thought was a necessary reform in their Criminal Law. What he wanted to impress upon the Committee was that the character of this offence was so horrible, and the injury done to the victims of it so great, and the degraded character of the man who committed it so revolting, that no punishment could be too severe for him, and that, in the interests of society, any punishment that would best deter from the commission of the crime was a punishment they ought to adopt. The hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Hopwood) had drawn a very powerful picture of a man suffering this punishment; but the hon. and learned Member had drawn the picture on too broad lines, and the record which they had of the infliction of this punishment, subject to the restrictions of the Act of Parliament that he had referred to, would not justify that picture. The injury done to little children by this offence was an injury for life, and one that it was impossible to estimate the consequences of; and, unfortunately, the crime and injury were those to which the children of the working classes were especially subjected. The children of the rich were protected, to a great extent. There were servants constantly looking after them; but the children of the poor were constantly at the mercy of the public, and it was the duty of the public, so far as they could, to protect them from these offences. During the Assizes at Stafford, which were taking place that week, there had been one or two most horrible cases of outraging little children—one of these being a case in which a stepfather took advantage of his position to outrage the child of his wife under circumstances of most disgusting brutality. Now, he had no compassion or pity for such scoundrels. He should like to see them flogged. He thought flogging would not only be the proper punishment for the offence, but would have a great deterrent effect on the crime; and in this matter he was not going altogether on his own opinion. He would not rest the matter on his own opinion—he would give them one or two high authorities. In the first place, take the opinion of a well-known Judge, a person no one could charge with being a sentimental Judge, but one of the strongest Judges who had ever sat on the English Bench, and who had had, perhaps, a larger experience in the administration of the Criminal Law than anyone else—namely, Lord Bramwell. What did he say? Why—

> "If their Lordships only knew, as well as he did, who the persons were who committed these offences, they would find that, in all probability, the anticipation of a flogging would have a far greater deterring influence upon such persons than anything else; and particularly upon those who committed it on defenceless children under the influence of a detestable superstition."—(3 *Hansard*, [280] 1387.)

The Earl of Shaftesbury, in the same debate, said—

> "He had put the question to a number of the criminal classes, and he found that they preferred months of imprisonment to one flogging," and that he "he believed flogging would have a more deterrent effect than any other punishment."—(*Ibid.*)

The Amendment had been accepted by the House of Lords without a division. Then, the present law inflicting the punishment of flogging for robbery with personal violence had never been complained of as in any way working unjustly or unfairly. The Judges ordered that punishment according to their discretion; but it was never ordered except in cases of robbery and violence of great atrocity. That punishment, he was satisfied, would meet with the concurrence of the public opinion of the country. If it had been abhorrent to it in the case of crimes of robbery with violence, it would have been long since swept out of the Statute Book. He would call the attention of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary to a still higher authority than any he had quoted yet, and one which, he thought, would have weight with the right hon. Gentleman, and which ought to have weight with his Colleagues. He was about to quote from the Prime Minister —and he could not put the arguments for the clause more tersely or more unanswerably than the Marquess of Salisbury had put them when this clause was passed by the House of Lords. What did he say? Why that—

> "He deeply regretted that Her Majesty's Government could not accept the Amendment."

The Government had declined to accept it on the ground, principally, that they would have some difficulty in passing it through this House; but they afterwards withdrew from that position—

> "He should like to know the reason why. The offence was one of the most horrible that could be conceived, the most defenceless girls of the community were especially exposed to it, and a widely-spread superstition made it far commoner than it would be. The men who committed it were unable to foresee what was involved in penal servitude for life; but they understood the pain arising from corporal punishment. If ever corporal punishment was a just instrument to be placed in the hands of the law-giver, for the purpose of repressing odious crimes, it was in the present case. Therefore, if the Amendment were pressed to a division he should vote for it."—(3 *Hansard*, [280] 1386.)

He (Mr. Fowler) appealed to the Government not to run away from the decision and the action of the Prime Minister on this matter; and on the lines and arguments with which the noble Marquess had advocated this most desirable change in the law he would ask the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary to consent to the introduction of these words.

Amendment proposed,

> In page 2, line 30, after the word "labour," to insert the words "and, in addition to any such punishment, the court before whom such person shall be convicted may direct that such person may be whipped, to the extent mentioned in and in the manner prescribed by the Act of the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh Victoria, chapter forty-four, entitled 'An Act for the further securing of the persons of Her Majesty's subjects from personal violence."—(*Mr. Henry H. Fowler.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SAMPSON LLOYD said, he regretted that he was not in the House when his Amendment was reached to leave out the words "for life, or for any term not less than five years." He warned the Committee, in registering its decision against persons guilty of the offence named in the clause, not to lose sight of cases where numbers of children herded together in one room, and young boys might become guilty. He thought that to pass a clause requiring a sentence of penal servitude for life, or for a minimum period of five years, regardless of the tender age of a prisoner, would be a mistake. In the case of boys, whipping was the proper punishment, and nothing but it.

MR. BARING: I rise to Order. I think the point the hon. Member is dealing with has been settled.

MR. SAMPSON LLOYD said, he was only speaking on the clause generally. If the clause passed as it now stood, children would be liable to be sent to penal servitude, and he asked that children under 14 should be punished with nothing but whipping—certainly not with penal servitude.

MR. BARING said, the hon. Gentleman was a little late in his proposal. It would, he thought, be wise to accept the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton. The punishment of flogging, they might rely upon it, would never be inflicted unless it were well deserved.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he did not know that the Prime Minister had any more experience in this matter of the prevention of crime than a great many hon. Members; therefore, however powerful might have been the language employed by him in expressing his views, and however well worthy the speech might have been of hearing, or was now worthy of reading, too much weight should not be attached to it. He (Mr. Hopwood) opposed the Amendment, believing that if they wanted to suppress crimes, increasing the severity of punishment was not the best way to do it. They knew the heavy punishments their forefathers had attached to a great many crimes, and how little they succeeded in that way in suppressing them. They knew how often verdicts of "not guilty" were returned because of the extreme severity of the punishments which would follow convictions, and every tyro in the science of law knew how little effect extreme penalties had exercised on the criminal classes, even where the inducement was so little as stealing 1*s*. in a dwelling house, and a multitude of similar offences. Some of those offences were so small that it would have been thought that whipping would prove a sufficient deterrent, and yet, as a matter of fact, even death had not been. He would remind his hon. Friend that in the olden time whipping had been a punishment for stealing. It was only superseded some 40 or 50 years ago by the introduction of the House of Correction system, which was introduced by those who were philanthropists, and not only by them, but by those who were convinced that this whipping business was a mistake, and really injured those who inflicted it. It injured those who heard the sentence given; it injured the Judges who gave it; and reduced the feelings of mankind to a lower level of sensibility. That was the only ground on which they could try to convince or impress those who were advocates of this brutal system. Those who were now in power must be brought to understand what the objection was to this punishment. They must be taught that there was something debasing about torture punishments not only on the men on whom they were administered, but on society, which was conniving at, or was accessory to, the punishments. The enormity of the offence was spoken of. He granted it. They pictured a child and a grown man, who was old enough to know better, and they were shocked at the baseness of the act. But his contention was that they were not to fix their eyes alone upon the offence as being so enormous that they must punish it in this way. They must look to see what was the object of punishment, and how punishment operated. For his own part, he was bound to say he had little belief generally in laws of this kind. He admitted that in their society it was necessary to have laws; but he believed that, with regard to crime in the country, they might go on the dead level of averages. The same crop came up at the Assizes, the same crop at the Sessions, probably, of late years with a few diminutions—diminutions which had begun to be marked, and which he hoped might go on—but all this improvement was entirely irrespective of the question of the punishment they inflicted. To operate upon the community by social regeneration, they must repress all brutalizing influences. Public opinion was anxious for the repression of these influences, and that a section of the public were crying out just now for the enactment of these cruel punishments was, he thought, attributable rather to inexperience of such matters than to a thirst after reprisals and revenge against those they thought or felt had inflicted on them an irreparable injury. He wondered his hon. Friend had not said that this punishment of flogging had put down garotting. The House had dealt with garotting by adopting this punishment. When one of its Members was stricken down and robbed the House ran into a panic, just as it had done now, and had declared that it must have whipping and flogging. A horrible, selfish feeling was aroused in the House, and it passed an Act to legalize this punishment. The Minister of the day—Sir George Grey—did his best to resist it; but the House passed it over his head. That was the measure they were asked to admire—a measure which was opposed by, probably, one of the most intellectual men in the House, and opposed by him because he was doing his duty. That was the punishment they were now called on to add to. What had happened? Why, the Act was passed; but before it came into operation, a number of men—the specialists, he might call them—were arrested, and were tried and sentenced. Those facts had been related in that House 20 times by his hon. Friend the late Member for Leicester (Mr. P. A. Taylor); but the same thing went on, the same ignorance was shown. "Oh! it put down garotting!" it was said. It did nothing of the kind, as could be shown on irrefutable evidence. The Bill was passed; it was to come into force in the following November. The men who composed this gang, and who, by the way, had been taught this garotting by a prison warder, who put on the hug, as he called it, on board one of Her Majesty's convict ships, when he wished to reduce refractory convicts to submission, showing how severity of punishment and cruelty on the part of the representatives of the law re-acted to the injury of society—this gang was arrested in London, and tried by that very Lord Bramwell whom the hon. Gentleman (Mr. H. H. Fowler) had referred to, at the Old Bailey, and punished under the then existing law. They were condemned and sentenced to long terms of penal servitude; but there was not a flogging given amongst them; and Mr. Russell Gurney, the Recorder, when he met the Grand Jury the following month, was able to congratulate them on the punishment of the garotters and the cessation of the crime of garotting. Nothing in the form of garotting—of that scientific form of garotting—had occurred since. They had robberies with violence which were sometimes treated with this punishment, but their number had not diminished. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. H. H. Fowler) had referred to some of the Judges. Well, a good many others, as the hon. Member was aware, had expressed their opinion against it, and had always refused to adopt it. Lord Bramwell was quoted, but many of his Lordship's learned brethren and friends took a very different view of this subject to that which he himself took. No doubt Lord Bramwell was very thorough in all he did—and it might be at times a little stern and a little severe—but they were not called upon to support him in all he did and in all he thought. He (Mr. Hopwood) preferred to call into court the right hon. Gentleman the present Home Secretary, who had probably had more experience in connection with matters of this kind than any man living. His hon. Friend on the Front Opposition Bench (Mr. H. H. Fowler) did not remember that the right hon. Gentleman (Sir R. Assheton Cross), when he came into power in 1874, was called on, by a strong expression of opinion behind the Ministerial Bench, and perhaps on the Opposition side of the House, to apply flogging as a punishment in cases of violent offences, among others of brutality on the part of husbands towards their wives. The right hon. Gentleman thereupon, in his position as Secretary of State, gathered the opinions of all manner of Judges and all manner of Chairmen of Quarter Sessions. The right hon. Gentleman would, he thought, agree with him that the majority were in favour of the punishment. It was very amusing to notice that the Scotch Judges, who, avowing that they had no experience in the matter, declared in favour of the punishment of flogging, saying they had no doubt it was an excellent practice. What had the right hon. Gentleman done when he came to dissect all the evidence and consider what course was to be taken in the matter? Why, he came to the conclusion that it would be unwise—he (Mr. Hopwood) submitted that the right hon. Gentleman did, for his acts showed it—to go back upon their legislation in the matter; that it would be a retrograde course; and that the result would be ineffective, and injurious to the public interest. The right hon. Gentleman had declined to take the course suggested to him, and dropped the Bill which he had brought in. The result of the right hon. Gentleman's inquiry was to be found in a large Blue Book. It comprehended the opinions of an immense number of persons competent to say what they thought; but it had remained undusted on the shelves of the Home Office from that day to this. The country had been freed from this barbarous importation into its Criminal Code. He (Mr. Hopwood) resisted—he should resist to the utmost—every such effort to brutalize the law, for if fitting torture was to be inserted in the Bill they would have to resort to the cognate or correlative tortures of ancient days which were applied to these offences. He objected to torture of every sort, and he especially objected to it in cases where, as his hon. Friend said, "there was no danger, because you always have medical testimony to prove whether the offence has been committed or not." He (Mr. Hopwood) did not think so much of medical evidence in these matters. The important question always was—"Is that the man who did it?" not whether the thing was done. They might have a man convicted on the evidence of two children—or of one, the other not being old enough to give sworn testimony—and sentenced; and afterwards it might turn out that he was not guilty. In the meantime, before his innocence was established to the satisfaction of everyone, the unfortunate man would have his back flogged and scarred and indented to gratify this notion of strengthening the Criminal Law. He thought the Committee would act wisely in rejecting the clause.

Mr. MONK said, he hoped that when the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) was seated on the Judicial Bench—as he trusted, before many years, he would be — that he would find this Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H.

Fowler) on the Statute Book; and he was quite sure that, whatever present Judges might think of the punishment of flogging in cases of garotting, and whatever construction might be put upon it, the hon. and learned Gentleman, on finding persons guilty of this abominable offence, would order flogging to be inflicted on the criminals. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said that years ago the punishment of death had been inflicted for very small offences. That might have been the case — no doubt, it was the case; but this was not a small offence that they were now discussing. When the hon. and learned Gentleman said that flogging was not a deterrent in cases of garotting he would ask him could he suggest himself any greater deterrent than flogging in a case like this? Flogging, however, had been a deterrent in the case of garotting, and he was certain that persons who might be guilty of an offence of this nature would think once, and twice, and thrice before they committed the offence if they believed they would have their backs scored, even in the cruel manner which seemed to raise the susceptibilities of his hon. and learned Friend. He hoped the Committee would accept the clause of the hon. Member for Wolverhampton, because he was satisfied that flogging would be found a great deterrent against these abominable crimes.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) drew a very interesting analogy between hanging and whipping. There was this about the two punishments—that neither could be recalled; if a man was flogged no process of law could relieve him from the disgrace attending the punishment. But there was one observation he wished particularly to make, and it was that this horrible offence—and he could conceive no offence deserving of severer punishment than that now under consideration—this offence was, unhappily, committed by persons in various classes of society, and he was afraid it was the practice of Judicial Tribunals in this country to award whipping to persons of one class of society only. He had no confidence that if whipping were provided as a punishment for this horrible offence it would be administered to persons of considerable social standing if they should happen to be brought within the meshes of the law. The Committee had not yet heard the opinion of the highest authority in the House on the subject. They had some right to look for "light and leading" from the Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross) to whom the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) had referred as, perhaps, one of the most experienced authorities upon this very important question.

Captain PRICE said, that as no one on the Ministerial side of the House had as yet spoken upon this matter he rose to say if the hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) pressed his Amendment to a division he would be happy to vote with him. A good deal had been said about the deterrent effect of flogging. He wished to say this as regarded the Navy —and he was not one who wished to see flogging re-introduced into the Navy —that ever since the abolition of flogging in the Navy the cases of assaults on superior officers had very largely increased. During the last eight or 10 years before the abolition of flogging, and whilst flogging was, so to speak, dying out in the Service, the cases of assaults upon superior officers increased in the proportion as the cases of flogging decreased. There were Returns in the Library which bore out exactly what he said. He was perfectly satisfied that flogging did most decidedly act as a deterrent in the case of garotting.

Mr. HASTINGS was desirous of saying a word or two upon the Amendment moved by the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler), because it carried out a suggestion which he made to the Grand Jury of his county about a year ago, that it was absolutely necessary that in these cases a more severe punishment than the law provided should be given. He made the suggestion for the reason that during the 15 years that he had had the honour of being one of the Chairman of Quarter Sessions in Worcestershire this kind of offence had been continually increasing. He found, on looking through the Calendars, that now there were usually seven or eight of such cases out of a total of 30 or 40 cases. Within the last 10 years there had been upwards of 200 assaults upon children by adult men, tried at Assizes and Sessions in his county. He had never passed a lenient sentence in any one of those cases, and therefore he could only come to the conclusion that the present punishment of imprisonment was not sufficient to prevent an increase of those abominable offences. What the state of things was in the rest of England he did not pretend to know; but he believed the judicial statistics would show that this crime had increased in the country generally. It was a crime which Parliament would do well to deal with with the greatest severity. He was not at all in favour of the punishment of flogging as a rule; but he thought that with regard to particular offences it was necessary to take into account their nature, and to see what was best adapted to check them. What was this offence of assaulting innocent children? It surely was one of the most brutal offences in the world, and, therefore, one which might very well be met by a certain amount of brutality in the punishment. He should be very glad if Parliament would try whether the punishment of flogging would not act as a considerable deterrent in regard to offences of this kind. He was afraid that while certain kinds of crime in this country were fortunately on the decrease, there had not been a decrease, but, on the contrary, a considerable increase, in the offences which sprang from brutal passion. He believed the best thing the Committee could do was to adopt this Amendment, and see whether flogging would not prove effectual, especially as the crimes aimed at by this Bill were peculiarly heinous.

MR. HOPWOOD inquired if it was customary in Worcestershire, a division of which the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Hastings) represented, to try cases of this description which were not triable at Quarter Sessions?

MR. SAMUEL SMITH regretted that when the hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) moved his Amendment there were very few Members present, because he was sure that if there had been a large Committee it would have been very much moved by the arguments used by the hon. Gentleman in his very excellent speech, arguments with which he (Mr. S. Smith) entirely agreed. Some of the cases which came before the public were almost too horrible to mention. He would read a line or two to the Committee with regard to one case well known in the City of London, and ask hon. Gentlemen if flogging was too severe a punishment to inflict upon the offender. This was what one of the gaol chaplains in London had written—

> "There is a monster now walking about, who acts as a clerk in a highly respectable establishment, who is 50 years of age. For years it has been his villainous amusement to decoy and ruin children. A very short time ago 16 cases were proved against him before a magistrate on the Surrey side of the river. The children were all fearfully injured, possibly for life."

He (Mr. S. Smith) believed there were 80 cases of injury proved against the man. [An hon. MEMBER: Rubbish!] He could give the name to the hon. Gentleman who said this was rubbish. To show the frequency of this offence he might say that it was only that day he had cut out of a Liverpool paper another case, in which no less than 30 instances of injury to children under 13 years of age were charged against one man. A great many cases of the most dreadful kind had come before him in connection with the various benevolent Societies in which he was interested—some of them were almost incredible. The men who committed those offences seemed to have such a propensity to commit them that it almost amounted to insanity, and he did believe that no punishment would restrain that class of brutes so effectually as flogging. He believed flogging would act as a much greater deterrent than any amount of penal servitude. It was the only kind of punishment that those brutal natures could feel, and he was convinced of this—that throughout the country there was growing a very strong determination that far more severe punishment should be meted out to those offenders. If he was not mistaken they would before long see a very extensive application of the law of lynching in this country. ["Oh!"] Yes; he believed they would see the application of the lynch law to the monsters whose whole lives were devoted to this detestable occupation. He believed that in no country except England would such men be allowed to go about unharmed; certainly in the United States brutes like those would soon receive a taste of the lynch law. Flogging was a lenient punishment for cases of that kind. He would ask hon. Gentlemen who objected to the infliction of flogging what would be their feelings if their own little daughters were assaulted? What would they think if their little girls of four or five were injured for life, as he had known several young children to be? Would they consider flogging too severe a punishment to impose? He held there was nothing in the last degree cruel or barbarous in flogging for such offences. Punishment was the expression of the righteousness of justice, and the conscience of the people demanded a severe punishment in these cases. He believed that if the question were put to the vote of the millions not one man in 1,000 would be found to say that flogging ought not to be a part of the punishment. He hoped the Committee would accept the Amendment. He was sure that by so doing they would give satisfaction out-of-doors. He had received many resolutions from meetings asking for flogging. This was essentially a working man's question, and the working men were crying out that flogging should be the punishment of the men who went about ruining little girls by the hundreds.

Mr. FINCH-HATTON said, the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) appeared to produce a considerable impression upon the hon. Members who sat near him by the reason he gave for the failure of the very severe punishments which were known at the beginning of this century. Surely it could not have escaped the hon. and learned Gentleman's recollection that at the beginning of the century there was great inequality in the punishment meted out to offences against the person as compared with offences against property; that the punishments in the latter case were such that the conscience of the nation revolted against them; and that juries could hardly be found to convict, or Judges to pass sentence, because of their severity. It really became a regular system amongst criminals to take the chance of whether they met with a hanging Judge, as he was called, or one who would not pass the capital sentence. But in the present case it could not be contended that the punishment which it was now proposed to inflict for this villainous offence was otherwise than one which ought naturally to follow it. The offence was such that if the offender were to walk up the floor of the House there was not an hon. Member who would not be inclined to apply a whip, supposing he had one, to the fellow's back. There was a great difference between these cases and those to which the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Hopwood) had alluded. He (Mr. Finch-Hatton) intended to vote for the Amendment, and had felt bound to point out how false the historical analogy of the hon. and learned Gentleman was.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, the question had been discussed pretty fully, and he did not know that they would gain very much by discussing it at any greater length. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) asked if he (Sir R. Assheton Cross) would give his opinion on the subject. Of course, he was bound to do so, quite irrespective of any appeal which might be made to him in the matter. There was one thing he regretted about the question of flogging, and that was that it was brought forward every now and again in certain individual cases, and never dealt with as a question of principle. However, he was called upon to deal with this Amendment, and in dealing with it he had to ask himself two questions. First of all, was this punishment known to their Criminal Law? About that there was not the smallest doubt. And the next question he had to ask himself was, if it was known to their Criminal Law, was it applied to offences of a higher or lower character to the one under consideration? Well, so long as the punishment existed he could not imagine an offence of a graver character, or one which was more deserving such a punishment, than that of an assault upon a child. If he were asked why he was in favour of flogging his answer would be that he believed that it was a deterrent. Hon. Members remembered the debate which took place not many years ago as to whether flogging was proper in the Army. One of the strongest arguments then advanced in favour of the abolition of flogging was that it deterred men from entering the Army. But if it deterred men from going into the Army it must also have deterred men from committing offences in the Army. He, therefore, thought it could not be said that the chance of having such a punishment inflicted was not a deterrent. He quite agreed that in this particular case the Committee ought to be very careful what they did. They ought not to legislate in a panic. They ought to act calmly and judicially, and that was the reason why he put the two questions he had mentioned to himself. As far as he could see, there was no offence of a worse character than the one they contemplated. The consequences were so grievous, and the mind of the man who could commit such an offence must be so brutal, that there was hardly any punishment for it severe enough. Do not let them be led away by the thought that the Judges would always impose this punishment. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) had said very truly that whipping when once administered could never be taken back. A man might be imprisoned and then released, but a man could not be relieved of the disgrace which whipping entailed. But it might be depended upon that that would make a Judge extremely cautious how he acted; if there was the smallest doubt in his mind as to the guilt of the accused he would assuredly not order flogging. If the hon. Gentleman the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) went to a division, he (Sir R. Assheton Cross) would, for the reasons he had given, vote for the Amendment.

SIR FARRER HERSCHELL said, he had long entertained so strong and decided an opinion with respect to the punishment of flogging that he felt he should do wrong if he did not express that opinion now. He yielded to no one in his horror and detestation of this crime. He quite agreed that no punishment could be too severe for it; but he strongly objected to the punishment of flogging for two reasons. The first was, that it was perhaps above all other punishments an unequal punishment. They inflicted the same number of strokes upon two men, and the chances were that the man who deserved to feel the punishment most felt it by far the least. It was an extremely unequal punishment. And, in the next place, it was of all punishments the most uncertain. They had to leave the punishment, as they must leave it, to the discretion of the Judges. There were some Judges who would always flog; there were some Judges who would never flog. Whether the punishment was inflicted or not depended, not upon the gravity of the offence, but upon the particular Judge who might chance to go that particular Circuit. He quite agreed that if men could be certain that flogging would always be inflicted it might act as a great deterrent; but wherever a particular punishment was uncertain, wherever it was doubtful whether a man would receive it or not, a man always gave himself the benefit of the doubt, and the punishment was not a deterrent to the extent it would be if the punishment were a certain punishment. He (Sir Farrer Herschell) knew it was the prevailing opinion that this punishment acted as a great deterrent in cases of crimes of violence—that it put down garotting. He invited anyone who entertained that belief to be good enough to peruse a Return which was laid on the Table of the House at his instance, because by that Return it was shown very clearly that garotting had been put down before the Flogging Act was passed. He obtained a Return of the number of crimes of violence at the Central Criminal Court and at every Assize for the two years before the flogging was introduced and for every year subsequently; and if anything was proved by that Return it was proved to conclusion that the offence of garotting had been substantially put down before the Act imposing flogging was passed. And how was it put down? He believed the suppression of garotting was due very much to the action of one Judge who sat at the Central Criminal Court. A number of these cases came before him, and he dealt with them with very great severity. From that time the cases in which this cruelty to persons was inflicted ceased. If hon. Members would read the Return to which he alluded they would find that if a Judge went Assize and flogged a number of men for a particular offence, the number of such offences at the next Assize did not diminish. If they could prove anything from it, it would be this — that a flogging Judge was followed by a number of garotting cases, and that a non-flogging Judge by a great diminution of that crime. He did not say that was the result; but he did maintain that if anything was conclusively proved it was that flogging had not the deterrent effect it was commonly believed to have, There must be uncertainty in the punishment. They could not say that every man who committed a particular offence should be flogged; and unless they did that they left the punishment uncertain. He had these strong objections to the punishment, and therefore he was opposed to any attempt to extend it. He knew the offence with which this clause dealt was one about which people felt most strongly. He knew that the inclination of everyone, as the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Finch-Hatton) had said, would be to inflict personal chastisement; but, after all, that was not the calm state of mind in which the Committee ought to deliberate as to whether punishment of this sort should be awarded. He had felt bound to make these observations to the Committee. This was with him a matter of principle which he had put before the House on previous occasions, and in relation to which he moved for his Return. Although he should be glad to see the most severe punishment inflicted upon these offenders, he could not consistently support the Amendment of his hon. Friend (Mr. H. H. Fowler).

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) said, that after the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir Farrer Herschell) he felt he ought very shortly to express the opinions he held upon this question. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said that the punishment of flogging was unequal. That was perfectly true; but surely all punishments were unequal. A term of imprisonment would have a very different effect upon an educated man than upon a man who had passed all his life in the slums. That argument, therefore, failed. Again, the hon. and learned Gentleman said that this punishment was uncertain. In answer to that, he would simply say that all punishments were uncertain so far as the Judges were concerned. It was perfectly well known that some Judges were in the habit of dealing with certain offences in a very severe manner, and that other Judges were inclined to deal with the same offences more leniently. But he might observe that the uncertainty was not in practice really so great as was supposed from the accounts in the newspapers, because the special facts, either in mitigation or increase of the offence, often were not stated, yet it was by these that the Judges were influenced. Therefore, he could not agree with the objections which the hon. and learned Gentleman had raised to the infliction of flogging. In his opinion, this punishment would not be more unequal than any other punishment, neither would it be more uncertain than any other punishment. Then they had to see whether the punishment was a fitting one for the offence. If the offence was a very degrading one, a degrading punishment was a suitable punishment to inflict. A man who could commit this offence must be of so degraded a mind that he would not be further degraded by the punishment. But the punishment being a severe one might deter a man of a less degraded mind from committing this offence. The hon. and learned Gentleman said they were not in a judicial frame of mind to settle this question, because they each felt they would like to inflict a flogging upon any man who committed this offence. But was not that very good proof that the punishment of flogging was a proper one? They each felt that flogging was a punishment that they would inflict, and willingly inflict, upon a man who committed this offence; and surely that feeling was not an unfair test of the fitness of the punishment to be imposed. He had ventured to state his views before the Committee because he felt as strongly in favour of flogging for such an offence as that under consideration as the hon. and learned Gentleman felt against it, although he must admit that he generally felt great diffidence in his own opinion if it ran counter to that of the hon. and learned Gentleman.

MR. JACOB BRIGHT said, he thought his hon. and learned Friend (Sir Farrer Herschell) had fully exposed the delusion so widely prevalent that flogging put down garotting. He (Mr. Jacob Bright) remembered having a talk on the subject some years ago with Lord Aberdare, at that time Home Secretary. Lord Aberdare told him that he had gone into the whole question, and had found that garotting was not put down by the lash, but by other causes. The late Solicitor General (Sir Farrer Herschell) had shown that there were other punishments that might deter garotting and deter any other crime—punishments which were not brutalizing to the individuals who received them, and not brutalizing to the general public. His hon. and learned Friend the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) called the attention of the Committee to the fact that in 1874 the Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross), although greatly pressed to extend the practice of flogging, had the strength to resist the pressure. He (Mr. Jacob Bright) regretted that the right hon. Gentleman had not had the strength to resist the proposal of the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler).

MR. EDWARD CLARKE said, he could not help joining in the protest of the late Solicitor General against this clumsy mode of dealing with the subject. He was greatly surprised at the speech of the Home Secretary. The Committee ought to be guided by the Home Secretary; but, instead of giving them his advice, the right hon. Gentleman waited until several speeches had been delivered, and then he got up and made a speech in which he said he had asked himself two questions—first, whether this punishment was already recognized by the law; and, secondly, whether the offences for which it was now inflicted were more or less serious than offences under the Bill. That was not a logical way of dealing with the subject. There might be a good deal to be said on both sides of this question. If the punishment was a good and justifiable one, then let it be extended. The hon. and gallant Member for Devonport (Captain Price) argued that the punishment existed at present on the Statute Book for lighter offences than this, and that therefore it was a proper punishment in this case. It had never been shown, however, that the punishment of flogging was a deterrent. Some hon. Gentlemen said that flogging in the Army deterred good men from entering it, and, therefore, it would deter men from committing this offence. That did not seem to him to be logical. Then his hon. and learned Friend the late Solicitor General (Sir Farrer Herschell) said that the punishment was unequal and uncertain; and the Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) said that all punishments were unequal and uncertain. That might be so; but in the case of imprisonment there was a Court of Appeal—there was a Secretary of State who might be appealed to in regard to the sentence given—whereas in the case of flogging that security disappeared. The Judges, moreover, were not to be trusted with the power of inflicting a punishment of so cruel and humiliating a character without the chance of reversal. He did not believe this barbarous punishment was any deterrent at all; and, speaking as one who was anxious for the efficacy of the Bill, he believed hon. Members were damaging it by putting in a provision of this sort. He was glad to join the late Solicitor General in the protest he had made.

MR. LABOUCHERE remarked, that his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. E. Clarke) was surprised that he did not receive any guidance from the Government. Was he not aware that the Government always waited to see which way the cat jumped before hinting which way they were going? He was himself altogether against the punishment; but why did the Amendment say "may?" Why not "shall?" Either a man ought to be flogged or he ought not; and the hon. Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) ought to have the courage of his convictions, and make flogging obligatory on the Judges, so that if it were inflicted in one case it would be inflicted in all. The Amendment would have the effect of setting class against class. The opinion of a working man in Manchester was that flogging should not be introduced into the Bill, because, while it would be inflicted on the poor man, it would never be inflicted on the rich. His hon. Friend should certainly have made it obligatory on the Judge if he had determined to introduce the Amendment.

MR. PICTON wanted to say one word in justification of the vote he was about to give. He was distinctly opposed to the flogging of men. It might be a suitable chastisement for boys. That was one thing, but the flogging of men was another. The sentiment of the whole country was against it, because it caused a man to lose all his self-respect. They could not meet brutality with brutality without, to some extent, lowering the public sentiment, and therefore he was strongly opposed to the adoption of the Amendment.

MR. STANSFELD said, he regretted very much that his hon. Friend the Member for Wolverhampton (Mr. H. H. Fowler) had moved this Amendment, and still more the speech which had been made by the Secretary of State in support of it. He would urge an argument which might have some effect. They were endeavouring to pass a Bill which was not passing very rapidly; and he would ask was it tactical or prudent to introduce Amendments upon which the strongest differences of opinion existed in the House? He must say for his part that, although deeply interested in this Bill, he would oppose this Amendment to the utmost extent in his power. It was not only the raising of a question that it was most unwise to raise, but this was precisely a subject on which the question ought not to be raised. He did not believe in the *lex talionis.* He did not approve of excessive legislation. What he did want, and what he did sympathize with in regard to this measure, was the legislation which was an exposition of the public sentiment of the country, and which was required by public opinion at that moment. They were dealing with a moral question, and it was not enough to say that the offence was a degrading one, and that the punishment for it should be degrading too. What they wanted was to pass a law which should be a declaration to the community that they had opened their hearts and their eyes to the subject, and that they were determined to discourage vice, and to repress with a firm hand the crimes which were the consequences of vice. It did not follow, however, that it was wise, as far as punishments were concerned, to legislate in excitement. He therefore submitted to the Committee that it would be far wiser not to raise questions which were altogether outside the scope of the measure, but, in the interest of passing the Bill, to withdraw the Amendment.

Mr. WARTON said, he would not detain the Committee long; but he wished to explain the vote which he was about to give, because he took a different view to those which had been expressed. He did not take a sentimental view of this question, and he was not in the same state of excitement as the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Samuel Smith). He (Mr. Warton) believed that flogging might in itself be a useful punishment, and yet he should vote against the Amendment, and for this reason—that they had by this clause extended the age from 12 to 13. The late Home Secretary admitted that a girl of 13 might well appear to be 15; but it was not now, however, a girl who looked 13, but a girl who was 13; and in these cases there were societies who would resort to every artifice to insure a conviction. The punishment of flogging once inflicted could not be made the subject of reparation; and, although he approved of the practice of flogging, and would extend it in certain cases, he should, for the reasons he had given, vote against the Amendment.

Mr. LYULPH STANLEY said, he thought that it was a little hard that an Amendment such as this, and re-opening so important a question as it did in the general law, should be brought forward without being proposed upon the responsibility of the Government. He agreed that the criminal they were dealing with was one of the most animal criminals in the world, and, if they regarded the criminal only, society might be all the better if they hanged him. If they did not hang more worthless people than they did, it was not out of regard for them, but because they were satisfied that cruel and severe punishments did more harm to society and the administration of the law; and because they were afraid that a great many of the philanthropists would develop into a most bloodthirsty class. The philanthropy of the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Samuel Smith) seemed to be degenerating into ferocity, and there was nothing so bloodthirsty as philanthropy on the war path. The hon. Member was a peaceful man, identified with many efforts for reclaiming the poor and wretched, and yet he actually wished to lynch people. He expressed his regret that they were so lukewarm that they did not proceed to lynch people; but he seemed to forget that the persons who were lynched by mobs in America were accused, but might not be always guilty. The reason why they objected to these cruel punishments was not for the sake of the criminal, but for the sake of society. In the state of panic in which the House had been for the last two nights, he thought that they were rather inclined to pander to the brutal propensities of the people. He objected to flogging, because it encouraged the brutal and savage sentiments of the people, and because it would have the effect of rendering them ferocious and cruel. In the interests of the general tone of humanity and civilization, he objected to legislation which carried them back to the time when punishment was degraded into torture.

SIR EARDLEY WILMOT said, he should go into the Lobby against this Amendment. He objected to flogging, because it was vindictive, and vindictiveness in punishments ought to be avoided. The other day, when Lord Wolseley was congratulated on the high discipline of his soldiers, he attributed it entirely to the abolition of flogging. They had abolished the pillory, they had abolished the stocks, and all other kinds of physical punishments, and he thought there was no reason whatever why they should introduce this brutal punishment into this clause.

SIR HENRY JAMES said, he was sorry to detain the Committee; but he felt so strongly on this matter that he could not refrain from saying a few words upon it. He had never given a vote in favour of flogging, and he hoped he never should. It was possible it might be regarded as a useful punishment if they were dealing with crime the result of deliberate premeditation, when the offender might calmly contemplate that he might have to suffer flogging. But there was no such possibility when the crime proceeded from passion, from mere brutality which suddenly impelled a man to commit an offence. Under such impulse, the offender did not stop to consider what the punishment would be. Of course, the crime now being dealt with was a brutal crime, and the man who committed it would have the heaviest secondary punishment in penal servitude for life. One object of heavy punishment was to prevent the man from repeating the crime, and to deter others from committing it. Was it likely that the mere addition of flogging to penal servitude for life would operate as a deterrent? Even in penal servitude there might be some hope of a convict becoming a better man; but would flogging, in the slightest degree, help to humanize him? If flogging were not a deterrent, if it would not prevent crime, was it worth while to be revengeful, and to subject a man to this punishment? It was a retrograde motion. They had to deal with their criminal offenders, as with their lunatics, on different principles from those formerly recognized. They used to ill-treat and torture lunatics, but now they took a higher view of their duty. They might as well go back to the thumb-screw, the boot, and other old modes of torture, as to revert to flogging, for flogging was torture. The punishment of flogging once inflicted could never be recalled, and yet conviction might be obtained on evidence which afterwards turned out to be false; but, like capital punishment, they could never recall flogging. He would not trouble the Committee with other arguments, except to say that he objected also to enlarging the discretionary power of the Judge in respect to punishments. There were Judges who would never inflict, and there were Judges who would always inflict, flogging. Therefore, whether a man was flogged would entirely depend upon whether he was tried by Judge A or Judge B. For those reasons, he hoped the Amendment would not be accepted.

SIR THOMAS CHAMBERS (The RECORDER) earnestly hoped the Committee would not pass the Amendment. He did not suppose that any alteration of their Criminal Code was adopted with more deliberation and after a longer public controversy than the abolition of punishment by flogging, and he should be sorry indeed if for any reason they should revert to that and take this retrograde step. He took a very great interest in the Bill, and therefore desired that the Amendment should not be carried, for if it was carried it would not increase the chances of the Bill passing. Very strong language was used as to the enormity of the offence the clause dealt with; the strongest epithets of reprobation were uttered, and everyone was strong in the desire to promote morality; but what said the clause to which the Amendment was proposed as a rider?—

> "Any person who unlawfully and carnally knows any girl under the age of thirteen shall be guilty of felony, and shall be liable to be kept in penal servitude for life."

In passing that clause they had turned immorality into crime, they had turned fornication into a felony, making an offence punishable by the second highest penalty of the law in future of what before that was immorality only. He had voted for the clause, thinking it right to raise the age, as they had, to 13 years. It was immorality now that by the passing of the clause into law would be turned into crime. When speaker after speaker got up and naturally, he would not say improperly, denounced the men against whom the clause was directed, let there be fairness to both sides. It might be that a girl of 13 looked much older than she was; it might be that she was not the seduced but the seducer; such things had been, and must be considered by men of common sense when converting a moral offence into a felony punishable by penal servitude for life. Amid the use of this strong language of abuse, let it be remembered that a man might be more sinned against than sinning; it would be unfair to assume that the man was guilty in all cases, and surely it was enough to make a man liable to penal servitude for life. He did not believe that the addition of flogging would have a real deterrent effect; if it ever had an effect, it was only in case of habitual criminals convicted of robbery with violence. He desired most earnestly that the hon. Member would withdraw his Amendment, or that the Committee would negative it.

Mr. J. G. HUBBARD said, he came into the House after the Motion was made, and his first impulse was to vote in favour of it, for he conceived that flogging was a most appropriate punishment for the person who in his person had so sinned. But the course of the debate had convinced him that he ought not to vote for it, for he observed that the punishment was a cumulative punishment, for on the first conviction a man would be liable to the sentence of penal servitude for life, and if added to that was the punishment of flogging, he did not see that it could have any deterrent effect. He should, therefore, vote against the Amendment.

Mr. H. H. FOWLER said, he would promise not to occupy more than a minute or two. He thought if anyone had heard without reference to date the speeches of his right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James) and the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken, he would imagine that this was a proposal for the first time to introduce the punishment of flogging, and therefore was open to the view his right hon. Friend might fairly urge against a retrograde step. But let the Committee consider for a moment what the Amendment proposed. It proposed that men who outraged—completely outraged—little children, should be placed in the same category with the highway robber who knocked down his victim and robbed him with violence. The cumulative punishment would be the same in both cases. A Judge had the power to inflict the punishment of penal servitude for life and also of flogging. Lord Bramwell, in the House of Lords, dealt with that point, and showed that this was introducing no new principle, because the law admitted the infliction of the punishment of penal servitude for life and also of flogging. He asked the Committee to consider how much they had heard to convince them that these horrible crimes against little children were increasing. The hon. Member for East Worcestershire (Mr. Hastings) gave his evidence of that as Chairman of Quarter Sessions. The crime of criminal abuse of little children under 12, he repeated, was increasing in the country. Then it was a reasonable inference to draw that the existing punishment was not severe enough to deter men from these crimes. He rested his case upon the deterrent point of view, and repudiated the idea that the Amendment was conceived in a revengeful spirit. He did not ask it in that spirit. A great evil, a great crime, was increasing, enormously increasing, in our midst, and if the existing punishment was not severe enough to deter men from such crimes, it was the duty of the Committee to increase the punishment. It was no new punishment; it was already on the Statute Book and known to the administration of the Criminal Law, and he believed that if the Committee sanctioned the Amendment, it would do more to put down these horrible crimes than any other clause in the Bill.

Mr. JAMES STUART said, no one had taken more lively interest in the Bill, no one felt more indignation at the crimes against which this clause was directed, than he did; but assuredly he would not be a party to introducing a brutal punishment into the Bill. It was a Bill directed against brutality, and he would not meet that with brutality. That flogging existed on the Statute Book he knew; he wished it did not, and, as a punishment for any offence, he hoped some time to have an opportunity of voting against it. He should vote against the Amendment; but he greatly hoped the hon. Member for Wolverhampton would withdraw it on this account—the Bill went very straight towards dealing with the subject in hand, and this, perhaps, was the only Amendment introducing extraneous matters on lines quite across those on which they could decide any question germane to the Bill.

MR. CROPPER said, it appeared to him that speakers against the hon. Member for Wolverhampton's Motion seemed to think that his Amendment was "shall," and not "may," inflict the punishment. It was not "shall;" it would only leave the punishment for cases of brutality, when a Judge "may," under extreme circumstances, use the whip. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Recorder of the City of London (Sir Thomas Chambers) spoke of a man tempted by a girl as one who did not deserve severity, and the punishment would not apply in such a case, it would only be inflicted upon monsters who under the influence of brutal passions committed the crime. In the past eight weeks there had been 30 such cases, and he did not think that anyone who read those cases over would think that the Judges could go far wrong in the sentences. In one instance, in Guernsey, they did inflict the lash; and he was inclined to think it would have a deterrent effect on natures insensible to anything but physical pain. Such men would be induced to think twice before criminally assaulting little children. If flogging was to be administered to an offender of 16 years of age, was he to be excused from that punishment the moment he passed beyond that age? He should give his vote for the Amendment, guarded as it was by giving the Judge discretion to apply the punishment in extreme cases.

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, the argument of the hon. Member who had just sat down, which he advanced in favour of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Wolverhampton, seemed to him (Mr. Davey) one of the strongest arguments against the Amendment. It went to show that the hon. Member for Wolverhampton had not the courage of his opinions, and had framed his clause in such a way as to vest the responsibility in the tribunal. If the hon. Member for Wolverhampton had used the word "shall," instead of "may," he would, to a certain extent, have got rid of one of the objections that had been urged against the punishment. It was notorious, as hon. Members had pointed out, that Judges took totally different views as regarded the infliction of the punishment—that there were Judges who flogged, and Judges whom nothing would induce to inflict the punishment. The punishment, therefore, was one most uncertain in its operation, while being most unequal, for reasons that had already been pointed out. Some of those who had spoken against it said the Amendment would be a retrograde step; and how was that answered by saying the punishment was already on the Statute Book? It was on the Statute Book, and he, with many others, regretted it. It was because of that regret, because he believed the placing it there was a retrograde step, and a recurrence to a state of feeling in which society thought itself entitled to administer the law in a revengeful spirit, that he objected to an extension of what he regarded as a revengeful, brutal punishment. He also joined in the regret expressed that this question should have been introduced in connection with the Bill before the Committee. With differences on points of detail, every quarter of the Committee was at one in the endeavour to make the Bill as efficient and useful a measure as it could be made; and he was quite sure the Home Secretary would acknowledge—though, no doubt, there had been criticisms upon the wording of the clauses—that there was a general desire to assist him in making this a useful measure. He regretted that a question of this kind, raising a question of principle upon which hon. Members felt very strongly, should have arisen in the course of the debate.

CAPTAIN PRICE said, he only wished to ask the hon. Member for Wolverhampton if he would accept an Amendment to his Motion, to insert, after "convicted," in the second line, the words "for the second offence of this nature?" That would insure that the case was an aggravated one for which the punishment was inflicted.

MR. HOPWOOD said, the Amendment was not done with yet. The proposal had now taken up two hours of valuable time at that period of the Session; and he must say it was a reckless thing on the part of the Minister who gave it his sanction—it was reckless of consequences, regardless of the passage of the Bill, that the hon. Member's Amendment was adopted. Both the hon. Member and himself had spoken at an earlier hour in the debate, when the House was not so full, and the hon. Member had availed himself of that opportunity to appeal to the Committee to hear him for a minute or two, and he (Mr. Hopwood) might make a similar appeal. An hon. Member (Mr. Hastings), who spoke from his experience as Chairman of Quarter Sessions, referred to the number of cases he had tried. Now, he would ask the hon. Gentleman if there was a single case coming under this clause that he had tried? No; he would have no jurisdiction over such. [*Interruption.*] The Committee was impatient now; but there was a later stage of the Bill upon which they would be heard, if necessary.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 91; Noes 125: Majority 34.—(Div. List, No. 262.)

Mr. M'COAN: I desire to say, Mr. Ritchie, that, by mistake, I voted in the wrong Lobby. My intention was to support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Wolverhampton.

Mr. ACKERS said, he would move the Amendment at the end of the clause which stood in his name.

Mr. WARTON rose to Order. Owing to the way in which the Amendments were arranged on the page, Notices appeared after this one which should come first.

The CHAIRMAN: I see nothing irregular in the hon. Member moving his Amendment now.

Mr. ACKERS said, in moving his Amendment, it would be necessary to make a consequential Amendment, because the Committee had already decided that the age should be 13, instead of 12. He had also been asked to strike out the words "justices, or justice, or magistrate," and to that he had no objection. The Amendment would then read—

> "Provided, That it shall be a sufficient defence to any charge under this section if it shall be made to appear to the court before whom the charge shall be brought that the person so charged had reasonable cause to believe that the girl was of or above the age of thirteen years."

He hoped it would not be thought that he was against the strongest possible measures that might properly be taken, in a reasonable spirit, against these abominable crimes. If these crimes were increasing, it was right Parliament should be alive to the matter, and take earnest measures to put them down. But, in that determination to put them down, let not injustice be done; let them not do something that would prevent the administration of the law being what all desired it should be —an even measure of justice earnestly carried out. This was, to his mind, a case of what might be called pitfall legislation. If they agreed to have the Proviso at the end of the next clause, he could not understand why a similar Proviso, altered to suit the particular case, should not be added to this clause, which dealt with a much graver offence. He was of opinion that it was most undesirable in legislation that persons should not know the punishment which was put before them—that they should believe that they were committing one crime or misdemeanour, and that they should find out that, by no special fault of their own, they were committing a crime which at the time they did not know they were committing, and that they would receive a punishment wholly out of proportion to the offence which they believed they had committed. He asked the Committee to consider that point, and to listen to the reasons which he had to urge in support of his Amendment. There were, doubtless, persons who would be glad that the heaviest punishment should fall on those who were guilty of what they considered to be the most heinous of offences. They might be right from a non-judicial point of view; but there were other persons who thought that only righteous judgment should fall on those who committed this most grievous fault. He thought that they in the House of Commons should approach the subject in that spirit; that they should approach it in the spirit of endeavouring to ascertain what would make the law best observed and prevent the offence as much as possible. They knew how easy it was to be mistaken as to the age of young girls. They knew that one of the highest authorities in that House—the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt)—with all his great faculties, was not long ago deceived with regard to the age of a girl whom he saw walking across a lawn, and that he conceived her to be two years older than she was. That was not a case of infrequent occurrence. It was the principle of this Amendment, and, as he had said, it had already been adopted in the Bill. Now, as regarded the question of age, he ventured to think that inasmuch as this Committee had in its wisdom extended the age originally proposed by the clause from 12 to 13 years —and he was one of those who cordially supported that extension—it was all the more reason why they should insert the Proviso which he was about to move. With regard to the question as to the appearance of girls, he had a strong opinion upon that subject, because, like the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby, he was not always able to judge correctly of the age of every person he saw. When he was a lad of 13 he was always mistaken for one of 18; he was then nearly 6 feet in height and had whiskers, and as everyone took him to be many years older than he was he heard a good deal more than was desirable. It had been asked what would be said by an hon. Member if his own child were to meet with this terrible injury? But even there he would say they must remember that there were cases of early precocity; that there were cases where it would be absolutely impossible for anyone to say what was the age of a girl. He said that with the strongest desire that this measure should be carried out in such a way as would most tend to deter people from the commission of these abominable offences; but he urged upon the Committee not to put a pitfall in the way of persons—not to allow a man to believe that he was committing one offence while he was committing another, and to suppose that he was liable to imprisonment when he was really liable to get penal servitude for life. He hoped that as the principle of his Amendment had been adopted by the Government with reference to the next clause, it would also be adopted with reference to this much more important clause, where it was not merely a question of penal servitude, but of penal servitude for life.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, at end, add—"Provided, That it shall be a sufficient defence to any charge under this section if it shall be made to appear to the court, justices, or justice, or magistrate, before whom the charge shall be brought, that the person so charged had reasonable cause to believe that the girl was of or above the age of thirteen years."—(*Mr. Ackers.*)

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH said, the Amendment which he had to move was of great importance in its bearing upon the case of offences against young children. The object of it was to allow the statement of children to be received by the Court without oath in corroboration or explanation of any other evidence which might be given in support of the charge. There were many charges of gross outrage on children which fell through owing to the ridiculous law which required the evidence of the child to be given on oath, and which compelled the Court to refuse the evidence of a child unless it understood the nature of an oath. A child might give the clearest possible testimony as to the nature of the offence, leaving no reasonable doubt in any sound mind that she was telling the truth; but at the trial, perhaps two months afterwards, she was required to take the oath, and then it was discovered by counsel that she did not know the nature of an oath. [*Interruption.*] Some hon. Members, by their impatience, seemed not to be aware of the gravity of this point. He had in his hand a report of three cases of assault on children whose parents would not be able to prosecute because the children did not know the nature of an oath. He asked the Committee and Her Majesty's Government to say that in those cases the Judge should take the statement of the child *quantum valeat* with the other evidence in support of the charge. With the permission of the Committee, he would move the first part of his Amendment only, as he proposed to move the second part at a subsequent stage.

Amendment proposed,

In line 30, at end, to add the words—"(1.) When a girl by whom or on whose behalf a charge is brought under this Clause is, in the opinion of the court, justices, or justice, or magistrate, before whom the charge is brought, too young to understand the nature of an oath, such court or justices, or justice, or magistrate may receive any statement she may make without oath, in corroboration or explanation of any other evidence which may be given in support of the charge."—(*Mr. Samuel Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he quite sympathized with the wish of the hon. Member for Liverpool that in no cases of this kind should inquiry be avoided or the offender escape punishment, and he was ready to go as far in that direction as was consistent with the course of law which, in his opinion, ought to be followed. But there was one point which they must not lose sight of, and that was that people were not often wrongly convicted. The Amendment proposed a total change in the existing law, which he, for one, would be very sorry to see introduced. There was no doubt that the evidence of many children was admitted by magistrates after very small inquiry; but he thought it very much better to leave the responsibility to them of saying whether children were fit to be examined than to run the risk of miscarriage of justice from the admission of the evidence of children who did not know the nature of an oath. The Amendment of the hon. Member involved a very important change in the law, the admission of which would require much longer consideration than they could possibly give it at that time; and, therefore, he hoped the hon. Member would not press his Amendment, because, although he had sympathy with its object, he should be obliged to vote against it if it went to a division.

MR. EDWARD CLARKE said, before the Amendment was withdrawn, he should like to address a few words to the Committee, because he thought the proposal of the hon. Member was a useful one. He had had a certain amount of experience in the conduct of cases of this kind, and he had always found that there was a difficulty with regard to the examination of the child. About 12 months ago a man was brought before the police magistrate at Lambeth; the magistrate did not think fit to allow the child to be sworn, and not having the child's evidence, the magistrate doubted that there was sufficient evidence to convict upon. But he thought it safer to commit the man for the assault on the child; and when the case came before the Surrey Sessions Court the evidence of the child was taken, and it was given in such a manner that it left no doubt in the minds of those who heard it that the prisoner at the bar had committed the offence. That man had nearly escaped punishment in consequence of the judgment formed by the police magistrate that the child was too young to understand the nature of an oath. With regard to young children, it seemed to him that the requirement that they should understand the nature of an oath was all nonsense. The questions asked of a child in the examination really produced no effect whatever. A child might be taught to answer two or three questions. For instance—"Do you know what will be done to you if you tell a lie?" And the child would answer—"God would be angry with me." Upon that the evidence would be admitted. But the nature of an oath, which was a thing of great solemnity, could not, he believed, be understood by or be conveyed to the mind of young children. He should be glad that the statement of the child should be heard for what it was worth by the magistrate, and by the Judge and jury who would have to decide upon the charge; and, subject to one qualification, he had certainly anticipated that the Government would accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Samuel Smith). One qualification was certainly necessary, because, as the Amendment stood at present, the statement of the child would be received; but there was no provision for any cross-examination of the child by the representatives of the prisoner or defendant. That, of course, could easily be arranged by the introduction of a few words providing that where such statement was admitted there should be the fullest opportunity of cross-examination by the prisoner or his advisers. He thought that with such a qualification the Committee would be well-advised to accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for Liverpool. He quite agreed that it made an alteration in the practice of criminal trials. This crime was, unhappily, committed on children of very tender age. They knew that in country districts there was a strange idea entertained that led to its commission. As the law stood now, the evidence of a child of five or six years of age could not be taken; but he thought that on the particular point on which she could testify, her evidence should be taken for what it was worth. He did not say that it should be conclusive without corroboration; but, with that corroboration, he did not see why the story of the child should not be accepted, although unconnected with theological considerations affecting the nature of an oath.

SIR HENRY JAMES said, that he had always thought that where a heavy punishment was awarded for a grievous offence they ought to be very careful that it should not be inflicted improperly. His hon. and learned Friend was willing to leave the Law of Evidence where it stood in respect of every other crime but this. [Mr. EDWARD CLARKE: No.] The hon. Member for Liverpool had said he should be content to move this Amendment to Clause 4 of the Bill. Now, let the Committee consider the case of a man standing on his trial for this offence. It was easy enough to make a false charge with the possibility of getting the man penal servitude for life. That false charge might have sprung into existence from the mistaken judgment of the child. Then the safeguard of corroboration of that evidence meant nothing at all. Of course, there would be some other evidence in the case; he presumed the case could not stand without it; but they were to allow the child to state its childish prattle, and say—"Yes, that is the man;" and the jury were to listen to it, and would be asked to convict upon it. His hon. and learned Friend said they might subject the child to cross-examination. But he asked if anyone would dare to cross-examine that child? His hon. and learned Friend thought there was some charm in an oath. But they were dealing with the case of children who were not intelligent enough to understand the nature of an oath at all; and it was because they were so young that they were asked to say they would accept the statement of the child. He did not object to the evidence being received because the oath, not being understood, was not taken, but because when there was not intelligence enough to understand the oath, in most cases there would not be intelligence enough to give evidence. If safeguards could be introduced so as to cause the intelligence to be found to exist before the evidence was received, much of his objection to the Amendment would be removed. If this alteration was to be made in the law, let them not say they would not receive this childish prattle in a case where a shilling was involved, and that they would receive it where a man's liberty for life was at stake. In his opinion, it was better to let 40 such cases go unpunished than have one wrong conviction of this kind. He urged the Committee to take care that they did not err on that side.

MR. FIRTH said, if the change in the law which was suggested by the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) in his Oaths Bill was made, a child would be able to make an affirmation. He had seen a number of children examined as to whether they knew the nature of an oath, and he absolutely agreed with everything that had fallen from the hon. and learned Member for Plymouth (Mr. E. Clarke) as to the administration of the oath to children. He thought that a child was as likely to give as truthful evidence with as without an oath. The argument in favour of the Amendment was that the statement of the child could be used by counsel, and the case itself settled on its merits.

MR. GREGORY said, they were dealing with a distinct class of crime, and it was now proposed to alter the Law of Evidence for that special purpose. He thought that this was not a fair proposal, or one that they could entertain. The case might be one of conspiracy; it might be a case of extortion; and very likely it might be got up by the parents. They were asked to allow the child to be put into the witness-box almost without the possibility of testing its evidence by cross-examination, and without the administration of the oath. He did not think the proposal could be entertained. It was one of very doubtful character, and altogether alien to the Bill before the Committee, and he hoped the Amendment would not be accepted.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he agreed with the hon. Member who had just spoken, that there was considerable danger, in connection with this subject, of false charges being made for the purpose of extortion; and that being so, the Bill was, of all others, one with respect to which they ought not to alter the Rules of Evidence, which would be a protection against charges of that character. He thought it would be a most dangerous thing to make this Bill the means of an alteration in the Law of Evidence, and therefore he hoped the

Amendment of the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. Samuel Smith) would not be adopted.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, as a lawyer, he objected to the proposed Amendment being adopted. His hon. and learned Friend the Member for Chelsea (Mr. Firth) had spoken of its being a farce to question a child to see whether it understood the nature of an oath. He (Mr. Hopwood) had no defence to offer for that particular mode of procedure. It was the nature of the Amendment before the Committee that he had to deal with. The question was, it being confessed that certain witnesses were not admissible by law to give evidence, whether this Amendment was to enact that their evidence should be admitted for what it was worth. He had known witnesses of this kind who had won upon the Court and jury with very doubtful results; and he had given one case, that of Mr. Hatch, in which the young witnesses gave the most childlike and innocent answers, which, upon subsequent inquiry, were established, beyond doubt, to be a pack of falsehoods. He thought the danger of a child's evidence was that it too readily persuaded Judge and jury; whereas the child might, after all, only be acting upon its impressions. It might be mistaken as to the person, and even as to the fact; and yet it was suggested that in all those cases they should make a record of what the child said, and then seek corroboration in some other quarter. Usually the mother came on the scene, and, finding the child injured, asked who had committed the assault. She asked if it was Harry, or Dick, or Tom, and thus put the words into the child's mouth. It was impossible that, in a civilized Court of Justice, governed by Rules that were the result of experience, they could adopt anything so loose, so informal, and so unreasonable as that which was now proposed.

Mr. ALBERT GREY said, the logical outcome of the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) was, that no child should give evidence except on oath. He was surprised that the hon. and learned Gentleman, who objected to the taking of oaths at all, should insist that when a child did give evidence it should give it on oath. He hoped the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. S. Smith) would stick to his Amendment, and, if necessary, go to a division. He could not understand this squeamishness about children giving evidence in cases where that evidence was absolutely necessary. These cases were of a peculiar character. They dealt with crime in connection with young children; and, therefore, the evidence of children might be wanted for what it was worth. Surely the Judge and jury could decide what the value of the evidence was. He certainly thought children should be allowed to give evidence, and that their evidence should be taken for what it was worth.

Mr. EDWARD CLARKE said, he hoped the Committee would forgive him if he added a few words upon this subject. He thought that if the matter were thrashed out, that which seemed to be the prevalent feeling of the Committee would be greatly changed. The hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) had spoken of the case of Hatch, which he detailed to the Committee yesterday, as an instance of the improper and wicked accusations which might be made against innocent men. But the children in that case were sworn. They were children of 10 or 11 years of age, and their evidence was taken upon oath. Though he was as anxious as the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt) could possibly be to put anything in the Bill to protect innocent men against unfounded accusations, what he would point out was this—that when a false accusation was about to be made, the natural and easiest instrument of that accusation was rather the child of eight or nine years, than the child of four or five years, because the little child of four or five could not be so easily tutored. Let him also point out that if the parents were making the child the instrument of a false accusation for a wicked purpose they tutored the child to answer questions, and so it was the evidence was accepted upon oath. Supposing a child of four or five or six years had been violated and injured, and that they got evidence that the man whom they suspected of committing the offence had been seen going and coming to the place, and had been heard to say something which was consistent with his guilt, they could not, as the law now stood, ask questions of the child. If any hon.

Members knew that a frightful atrocity of this kind had taken place, and desired to find out who had committed it, they would ask the child, of course, with great care, and they would be as careful as they could to ascertain whether anybody had been tutoring the child. Sometimes the child was the only witness they could take, and these offences must go absolutely unpunished in many instances, unless something like the principle of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. S. Smith) were adopted. He was afraid the Committee, having swallowed a camel, was now straining at a gnat. In one clause passed that evening they had given a larger opportunity than the Criminal Law had ever given before for false charges for purposes of extortion. In this case he did not believe the Amendment proposed would facilitate extortion; it would simply give a Criminal Tribunal exactly the same means of ascertaining the truth as every Member of the House desired to have, if he were called upon to decide a particular case. If the hon. Gentleman the Member for Liverpool would agree to add to his Amendment the words, "provided that there shall be the fullest opportunity for cross-examination," he (Mr. E. Clarke) would be very glad to go into the Lobby with the hon. Gentleman, however few there might be with them. With regard to cross-examination, let him say this, and he said it from experience, that cross-examination addressed to a very young child was by no means wasted. A careful and kindly cross-examination of a young child would as certainly discover the truth as the most severe cross-examination of a very much older witness who had been tutored would.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON agreed with the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Plymouth (Mr. E. Clarke), that if this question were argued out as they argued out the question of flogging a little while ago, the Committee would come to a very different opinion to that which seemed to prevail now. The object of the oath was that there should be some security that a person, by fear of the consequences either here or in a future state, would tell the truth. His hon. and learned Friend the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) had cited the case of Mr. Hatch; but in that case the children were sworn, and although they were sworn they committed perjury. What greater security could they have of the truthfulness of a child than a careful examination by the Judge as to the credibility of the child? He quite agreed that it would be a sad thing if an innocent man were convicted solely on the evidence of a child. A child could be tutored as to what it should say, even if it were sworn. In his opinion, a child of tender years was far more likely to tell the truth than a child of five or six years of age who had been tutored as to what it was to say when brought into Court. Cases had been brought to his attention in which there could be no doubt whatever of the truth of the statement of the child; but there had been a failure to put the law in force simply because the child did not understand the value of an oath. The change proposed was very desirable. It was quite true they were not legislating for a change in the Law of Evidence; but without such a change there would be no protection for young children, and that being so, he hoped the Committee would accept the Amendment.

Mr. PICTON said, that unless this Amendment, or something like it, were passed, they might as well pass no Act at all on the subject, so far as little children were concerned. The crimes which had most revolted them, which had so kindled the anger of hon. Members that they were ready to resort to brutality to put them down, were the assaults upon little children of four, five, and six years of age. Those little children could not understand anything about Hell, and very happily too; they were not supposed to understand the nature of an oath, yet they were the most truthful, oftentimes, of all witnesses, if only they were examined in a kindly manner. Unless the testimony of those children might be taken for what it was worth, these crimes would continue to go unpunished, as they were doing by thousands at the present time. He earnestly hoped his hon. Friend the Member for Liverpool (Mr. S. Smith) would persevere with his Amendment.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH said, he was quite willing to adopt the suggestion of the hon. and learned Member for Plymouth (Mr. E. Clarke), and add to his Amendment—

"The child may, as in the case of other witnesses, be subject to cross-examination."

Sir FARRER HERSCHELL said, there was no necessity to add the words, because, if the Amendment were carried without them, the child would clearly be subject to cross-examination.

Mr. EDWARD CLARKE desired to say that, if the Amendment were carried as it now stood, there certainly was no provision in it, or even in the clause, that a child should be cross-examined. He would suggest, however, to the hon. Member for Liverpool that he should withdraw the proposal to add words relating to cross-examination, and if it should happen that the clause were carried, he, with the hon. Gentleman's permission, would move the addition of words to meet the point.

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Gentleman move to add the words?

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH: No, Sir.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 120; Noes 123: Majority 3.—(Div. List, No. 263.)

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH begged to move the second part of the clause which stood in his name—namely,

> "And the court may, for the same purpose, allow a similar statement made by her before the committing justice or magistrate, and taken down in writing at the time, to be used for the same purpose at the trial."

The CHAIRMAN: I must point out to the hon. Gentleman that if he succeeds in carrying the second part of his clause, Clause 4 will not read.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH: Then I will move it on Report.

Mr. PICTON said, that in a word or two he could explain why he wished to move the addition to Clause 4 which stood in his name. At present no punishment was provided but that of penal servitude or imprisonment. The whole spirit of legislation had been against the imprisonment of young boys, and the law had provided that boys might be moderately chastised and saved from the disgrace of imprisonment. It was to make this clear that he asked the Committee to add the words he had placed on the Paper of Amendments.

Amendment proposed,

> In page 2, line 30, at end, to add the words—"Provided, That in the case of an offender whose age does not exceed sixteen years, the court may, instead of sentencing him to any term of imprisonment, order him to be whipped, as prescribed by the Act of the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth Victoria, chapter eighteen, intituled 'An Act to amend the Law as to the Whipping of Juvenile and other Offenders,' and if, having regard to his age and all the circumstances of the case, it should appear expedient, the court may, in addition to the sentence of whipping, order him to be sent to a certified reformatory school, and to be there detained for a period of not less than two years and not more than five years."—(*Mr. Picton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he thought it was very desirable to accept this Amendment, because offences by boys were by no means uncommon. He knew a case of a boy, 15 years of age, who misbehaved himself with three little children—one was 10, another 11, and the third 12 years of age. He was sorry to say that the girls were more or less consenting parties. The boy was tried at the Lewes Assizes in the year 1884, and sentenced to six months' imprisonment with hard labour. In his (Sir Walter B. Barttelot's) opinion, whipping would have a considerable deterrent effect in such cases.

Mr. HOPWOOD (who was received with cries of "Agreed!") said, they were not agreed, and he would move to report Progress if hon. Gentlemen desired it. He objected to the placing before the Committee of personal experiences. The illustrations which were given were, of course, given by hon. Members in perfect good faith, but with just such a touch of memory as to make them unreliable. They had had that night one hon. Member saying there were 40 of such cases somewhere. In how many years they were not told. Someone said eight years, while someone else said eight weeks. He did not believe it. There were societies which vamped up these things because the stronger appeals they made in the cause of charity, the more money flowed into the exchequer. His hon. Friend the Member for Leicester (Mr. Picton) brought forward this suggestion as one of which he was very much enamoured. He (Mr. Hopwood) desired to hear what his hon. Friend would do in a correlative case. This clause applied to a boy under 16. What was to be done with a girl under 16? Was she not on equal terms of guilt or innocence with the boy? Was she not to be whipped, or sent to a reformatory, or imprisoned? Why not?

She was as guilty as the boy. Was it not absurd for grown men to sit there and talk of flogging and whipping children? He wished to hear men speak out about these things. There must be some hon. Members who felt as he did, and he only wished they would give the Committee the benefit of their experience. This was an Amendment which should not be accepted. He should certainly divide against it, and do more against it if he could.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he did not see any reason why the Amendment should not be accepted. He wished to point out to the Committee that by the 29 & 30 *Vict.* c. 13, s. 14, whenever a boy who was under the age of 16 was convicted on an indictment of an offence punishable with penal servitude or imprisonment, and sentenced to 10 days' imprisonment or longer, he could be sent to a reformatory. Therefore, he thought the proposal as to reformatory schools unnecessary. As to the whipping, he agreed with it.

MR. FIRTH said, he had a short time ago read a statement by an East End clergyman, which went to show that if the Bill were carried without this alteration — supposing the rev. gentleman's statement to be true, and he had no doubt it was—it would make criminals of half the boys of between 12 and 16 years of age in that district.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER): Will the hon. Member (Mr. Picton) stop at the words "other Offenders?"

MR. PICTON: Yes.

The House being cleared for a division,

THE CHAIRMAN: Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 30, at end, to add the words—

"Provided, That in the case of an offender whose age does not exceed sixteen years, the court may, instead of sentencing him to any term of imprisonment, order him to be whipped, as prescribed by the Act of the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth Victoria, chapter eighteen, intituled 'An Act to amend the Law as to the Whipping of Juvenile and other Offenders,' and if, having regard to his age and all the circumstances of the case, it should appear expedient, the court may, in addition to the sentence of whipping, order him to be sent to a certified reformatory school, and to be there detained for a period of not less than two years and not more than five years."

MR. PICTON: You have read the whole of the Amendment, Sir. I withdraw all after the words "other Offenders." I wish to drop the latter part of the Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member at one time proposed to do that; but when it was objected to, he assented to the retention of the words.

Question put, "That those words be there added."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 204; Noes 24: Majority 180.—(Div. List, No. 264.)

MR. PICTON: I would propose now to omit all the words after "other Offenders."

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member cannot do it now.

MR. WARTON said, he had put on the Paper an Amendment to leave out Clause 4. He had put that Amendment on the Paper for the reason that the law, as it would be under the clause, was precisely what it was at the present moment, and what it was before the Bill was introduced at all. He had thought it unnecessary to have a declaration of the law twice over. Now, however, that alterations had been made in the clause which would change the existing law in two respects, he no longer thought it necessary to put the Amendment.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Defilement of girl between twelve and fifteen years of age).

MR. HOPWOOD said, he proposed to move to add, after "who," in page 2, line 31, "being of mature age, or eighteen years at the least." He had expected that before they had proceeded so far with the Bill they would have had some general information from the Government as to the age at which a youth would come under the penalty of this clause, and as to the age of protection adopted on the Continent. Pending some information of that kind, he moved his Amendment simply to raise the question. What he found in Foreign Criminal Codes was, that according to the age of the delinquent the punishment rose, or the offence became *nil.* He assumed in his Amendment that the age of responsibility should commence at 18—he was in somewhat of a difficulty, no doubt, because he did not know what the age of protection for girls would be;

but he assumed it would be considerably above what it was at present. They would probably have the pleasure of hearing the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary detail reasons for his own conversion in the matter when they came to the question of the age of the girl. Meanwhile, he proposed to fix the age of the male delinquent at 18—16 might more readily meet with the approval of the Committee; but he had put down 18 in order to obtain some expression of opinion from the Committee on which he could act.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 31, after the word "who," to insert the words "being of mature age, or eighteen years at the least."—(*Mr. Hopwood*).

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) opposed the Amendment. The Government had had no opportunity of saying what they had determined upon in the matter of the age of consent; but as to this Amendment, affecting the age of the person committing the offence, to accept it would be to introduce a complete innovation into their Criminal Law. The present law was well known, and, according to the clause—

> "Any person who unlawfully and carnally knows or attempts to have unlawfully carnal knowledge of any girl being of or above the age of twelve years and under the age of fifteen years shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, &c."

It seemed to him that, without very good reason for it, no such change as that proposed should be effected, and he had not heard from the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport any good reason for it.

MR. HOPWOOD said, there was no difficulty in supplying reasons. The new clause would effect a material change in the law, and the age of consent being raised to 15 or 16 would make the girl against whom the offence could be committed three or four years older than under the present law. That was a considerable addition, and was, at any rate, reason for some investigation—some inquiry—into the relative merits or demerits of the two parties to the delinquency. If he was to assume that all girls of 16 were to be protected in an Act of Parliament, he had a right to assume that some girls at 16 were as advanced as others at 20, and that a boy of under 16 might be whipped and imprisoned for an act for which a girl of much greater power of continence and much greater maturity was mainly responsible. There was nothing clearer in physiology than that a girl of 16 was two years older, in power of understanding and taking care of herself in this respect, than a boy of the same age. As to his reasons, he had many—they were obvious; and the Attorney General, in asking for them, was treating him with an off-hand air that he was not disposed to pass by. He and those who thought with him were determined to be heard upon the Bill, and they had by their criticisms justified, to a large extent, the position they had taken up. They had not been successful in all they had attempted; but if they had succeeded in introducing a calmer spirit into the discussion, they would, at any rate, have done something to benefit the country.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT wished to point out to the hon. and learned Member that the last Amendment which had been carried, which applied the punishment of whipping to boys under 16 years of age, really met the case he wished to meet. Everybody admitted that these offences were very often committed by juveniles who really knew very little about what they were doing. It would be, no doubt, a very serious thing if boys were sent to prison in large numbers. The last Amendment, however, as he had said, would meet the difficulty. It would be extremely dangerous to provide immunity from punishment in the case of a youth of 17 or 18. The Amendment could not, he thought, be allowed.

Amendment *negatived*.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): I now move to strike out "twelve," and insert "thirteen," in line 33.

Amendment *agreed to*.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON: I beg to propose the next Amendment standing in my name—to fix the age at 14.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. and learned Member cannot move his Amendment, the age of 13 having already been decided upon.

SIR BALDWYN LEIGHTON said, there was a series of Amendments on the Paper dealing with the age of the girl to defile whom it would be a misdemeanour, and it would be but right that they should be put from the Chair in numerical order. If that were not done, they might have the extraordinary exhibition of Members taking different views being in the same Lobby. He would ask the Chairman to deal with the Amendments numerically, commencing with the Amendment of the hon. Member for North Lincolnshire (Mr. Atkinson), that of the hon. Member for Leicester (Mr. Picton) following.

THE CHAIRMAN: I see nothing to prevent the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) moving his Amendment.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, he had to move in page 2, line 34, to leave out "fifteen," and insert "sixteen." The object was to raise the age from 15, as it now stood in the Bill, to 16. He was bound to say that when he first drew up the Amendment he had proposed to raise the age to 18; but, on considering the matter, it had appeared to him that he would have a much better chance of carrying his present proposal, especially when he bore in mind the view which the House of Lords had expressed on the matter. At the same time, he was bound to say that if the Forms of the House would allow an opportunity of voting in support of a proposal to raise the age above 16 he should avail himself of it. Now, why did they extend protection to girls of the age of 15? It was because they were not in that state of mind—in that advanced condition of mind—as to be able to foresee the consequences of the act they were about to commit. Well, girls of the age of 16 were in the same position. A girl of 16, as a rule, was comparatively a child. They did not allow such a girl to part with her property, and he thought they ought not to allow her to part with her person. He did not refer to cases where young people formed an attachment, and in an unfortunate moment allowed their passions to get the better of them. He referred to cases in which a man deliberately laid siege to a girl with the set purpose of ruining her—and he was sorry to say that such cases too often happened—cases in which a man used all the arts which his experience of life furnished in order to get a girl into his power and then take advantage of her. He contended that an act of that kind with a girl of 16 was a most serious one, and should be seriously punished. He, therefore, proposed this alteration of the age.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 34, to leave out the word "fifteen," and insert the word "sixteen."—(*Mr. Serjeant Simon.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'fifteen' stand part of the Clause."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, it would, perhaps, be just as well that he should state the opinion of the Government on this matter, because there were a great number of Amendments on the Paper to this part of the Bill, some proposing the age of 16, some 18, some 20, and some going as high as 21. He entirely appreciated the motives of all the hon. Gentlemen who had put down Amendments for altering the age; but this matter was one in which they were bound to be cautious what they were about. This was one of those particular parts of the Bill with regard to which public feeling out-of-doors had probably gone a great deal further than hon. Members should go, sitting there as legislators, in a calm and deliberate spirit to pass a law which should be carried out, and should not break down in consequence of their yielding to pressure from outside. It behoved them to be very careful. There was one consideration they should look to in this matter, and that was to the number of marriages which took place amongst young girls. It was rather extraordinary to see how different the numbers were at these various periods. Some would wish them to fix the age in this clause at 21; but if they took the records of the past five years, they would find that something like 18,000 persons had married under the age of 21. It would be impossible, therefore, to go to that age. To come to under the age of 20, the number of marriages was between 13,000 and 14,000; between 18 and 19, 7,000; and between 17 and 18, 2,000. When they came to under the age of 16 they came to a great drop, for the number was only 37. Between 16 and 17 the number was 100. It was evident from these statistics that the great gap was before the age of 16. Below that age very few marriages took place, and they might, therefore, assume that girls under that age were looked on as immature, and as having not arrived at the age of puberty. These, then, were the girls they desired to protect in the Bill. On the part of the Government, he urged the Committee to accept the figures he had quoted in the spirit in which he had made these observations. He trusted they would accept the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) fixing the age at 16.

Mr. JAMES STUART said, he should vote for leaving out "fifteen," and when the subsequent Question was put he should vote for leaving out "sixteen," with the view of endeavouring to get some higher age substituted. If he could obtain what he most desired, it would be that they should insert "eighteen." He knew it might be said that the Committee was yielding to clamour. [Mr. Warton: Hear, hear!] But in spite of the cheer of the hon. and learned Member for Bridport, there were many who desired the age to be raised to 18—and who would now, if they got the opportunity, vote for it—who had desired that age long before there was any clamour, and long before there was any expectation of a reasonable kind of their being able even to get the age of 16 accepted. If hon. Members looked at the various Petitions and Memorials which had been presented to that House on the question, they would not only find that the great majority spoke of the age of 18, but if they looked at those which spoke of 16 they would find that a great number—certainly many of those that he had had the honour to present—had mentioned the age "sixteen at least." Now, he knew it would be said that they would run the risk of false accusations being made, there being so many young girls on the streets under the age of 18; and that men might have to do with girls believing them to be over the age of 18, when it turned out afterwards that they were under it. Poor man! he should be very sorry for him indeed if he made a mistake of a day; but, on the other hand, did they not think that such an Act of Parliament as this, when it was passed, would have the effect of greatly clearing the streets of the prostitution of these young girls? He did not wish at all to delay the Committee on this matter; but he thought it might, perhaps, be worth the attention of the Committee, as the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone) was, unfortunately, not able to be present that evening, if he read a letter that right hon. Gentleman had addressed to him. It was—

> "1, Richmond Terrace, Whitehall, July 31.
>
> "Dear Mr. Stuart,—I find that Mr. Morley has inquired whether I object to its being known that in my opinion the protective age might properly be advanced beyond 16 in the Criminal Law Amendment Bill. I cannot consider that much weight is due to my judgment in this important matter as compared with that of others; but I have considered it as well as I could, and I personally should have been glad if this Government had found it consistent with their views to name 18 rather than 16 as the protected age.
>
> "Believe me, most faithfully yours,
> "W. E. Gladstone."

He hoped the Committee would adopt the age of 18.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, he had more than once invited the Secretary of State for the Home Department to tell them by what process he had been converted from the views he held on this subject seven or eight years ago. What was the reason that the Government had adopted the age of 16? He did not know that there was any other country on the Continent where people over the age of 14 had a special Act to protect them. No Member answered that point. If the Government had no response to that question, there was another thing he would like to ask them. Had they consulted the Judges who had to try these cases upon the question? No response. They had nothing to comment upon but the right hon. Gentleman's sudden conversion. There were no reasons given for it. Some hon. Members said 18 years ought to be the age, others said 16, and so they went on; but he warned them that they would be destroying the moral responsibility of the population in proportion to every year they raised the age of these protected girls. He contended that these girls who went wrong from an early age were just as familiar with the result of their actions as those of an older age. ["No!"] It was all very well to cry "No!" but those Members who did so were judging by their own families, who were carefully nurtured and preserved from contamination; but girls who went upon the streets came from a different class. They were not carefully nurtured; they had a familiarity with these things from an early age, and were quite able to take care of themselves. It was a monstrous thing to raise the age in this manner, and he did call upon the Government to rise in their places and give them some reason for what they were doing. Except in some of the more eccentric of the United States they could find no parallel for this Act, and he should like to hear reasons for it apart from mere declamation.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, his hon. and learned Friend had talked of sudden conversion in regard to this subject. As far as he was concerned, he had not been suddenly converted to the age of 16, because when the Bill was first introduced into the House of Lords two years ago the age was fixed at 16, and he had always approved of that limit. That was the age that was originally adopted, and he did not know why it had been altered to 15 this year. Sixteen was the age which was suggested by the Committee of the House of Lords, and the reasons for adopting it were given in the Report of that Committee. Now, the reason for raising the present age was because he thought it was necessary. Against the other proposal to raise the age from 16 to 18 he had no difficulty in giving a reason. At 16 a girl was manifestly a child, a person of tender years; but when they came beyond that, and grew to 18, they were women. If they raised the age to 18, cases such as the following might arise. A girl of 17 having been seduced by one man might then become the mistress of another, who would be liable to an indictment for misdemeanour for living with her. Surely the Committee would not contemplate with equanimity such an application of the clause as that. Then it was the opinion of those who had had to deal with these matters that they would be running very great dangers of extortion and misrepresentation, because nothing was easier than for a girl of 17 or 18 to represent that she was 20. It was quite plain also that the dangers of black mail were very much greater when they advanced the age than they would be if it were left at 16. These were, shortly, the reasons which had induced the House of Lords to adopt the age of 16.

SIR ROBERT FOWLER (LORD MAYOR) said, the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. James Stuart) seemed to anticipate that the passing of this Bill would put a stop to juvenile prostitution; but he wished to point out that it was all very well for the House to legislate, but the important thing was to have the legislation carried out by the police. They would certainly carry it out in the City, and he believed that if they carried out the law in the other parts of London as they did in the City, the streets would not be in the same disgraceful state as they were now, as any prostitute soliciting men was liable to 40*s.* fine or one month's imprisonment. He quite approved of raising the age considerably.

MR. ATKINSON thought the Committee ought to remember that they were there in a representative capacity, and must, therefore, judge outside feeling as well as the feeling in the House. If they were to judge of this matter from that point of view, they would find that the majority of the people were in favour of raising the age to 21. He could speak for Lincolnshire, for he had presented Petitions in favour of that age; and since he had been sitting there listening to the discussion he had received a telegram from a meeting at Hull, at which there were 4,000 persons present, stating that the people there were unanimously in favour of the age of 21. He thought those people were entitled to be considered, and therefore he should like to see that age adopted. If the Forms of the House allowed it later, he should certainly propose the Amendment to that effect standing on the Paper in his name.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD pointed out that 16 was a most impressionable age. Between 16 and 17 girls had the constitution of women, and were much more likely to become the prey of men than they were a few years later. If this Bill was to be passed so as to raise the age at all, he certainly thought it ought to raise it to 18. No woman could marry on her own responsibility at 18 or 19. She was obliged to turn to her parents or guardians, and if she could not dispose of herself in honest matrimony at 18, she ought not to be able to dispose of herself in iniquity.

DR. FARQUHARSON said, that girls often came to maturity at 14½, and if they took 16 they would cover all exceptional cases. If, however, they extended the age to 17, women were then perfectly well able to protect themselves; and if they were to go beyond that, there was no reason why they should not go to 30, 40, or any other age at once. He concurred in the Amendment which had the support of the Government.

Question, "That the word 'fifteen' stand part of the Clause," put, and *negatived.*

MR. JAMES STUART said, he was desirous of moving an Amendment to the word "sixteen."

THE CHAIRMAN said, it was a rule of Committee that no Amendment could be moved on an Amendment which simply consisted of one word.

Question put, "That the word 'sixteen' be there inserted."

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 179; Noes 71: Majority 108.—(Div. List, No. 265.)

MR. COURTNEY, in the absence of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood), who had given Notice of the Amendment, moved to insert, in page 2, line 34, after the word "years," the words "not being a common prostitute, or of known immoral character." He thought the proposal deserved, at least, some consideration.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 34, after the word "years," to insert the words "not being a common prostitute, or of known immoral character."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HOPWOOD, who entered the House while the Question was being proposed from the Chair, said, he should like to support his own Amendment; and he thanked his hon. Friend the Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) for his courtesy in coming to the rescue. He would state the proposition involved as simply as he could. Was there any Member of the Committee who was prepared to say that any son or relative of his should be brought under this law because he was inveigled, or enticed, or decoyed by a woman who was a woman of the town, because she happened to be under the age of 16 years? He thought the absurdity of this was so self-evident that he counted on a very considerable amount of support. The Amendment was absolutely necessary to protect people from the consequences of rash legislation.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) thought the Amendment ought not to be accepted, because it seemed to him to be wholly inapplicable to the clause. He quite agreed that every step should be taken to give proper protection; but he would ask the Committee to consider what they were doing with the clause. As it stood at present, it provided that any person who unlawfully knew or attempted to have connection with a girl above the age of 13 years, and under the age of 16, should be guilty of a misdemeanour. A great temptation would be placed in the way of men who committed this offence if the words "not being a common prostitute, or of known immoral character," were inserted. Every attempt would be made to get the girl to be a common prostitute, or to be one of known immoral character; and the result would be that, instead of there being exceptions, it would be all the other way. There was no reason to suppose that there would be many girls under the age of 16 who would be prostitutes; and so long as a girl was under that age, even if she were a prostitute, at least they might hope that she had not been a prostitute for a very long time—certainly not one in the sense of a permanent street-walker. He thought Parliament might well allow that there ought to be protection for a girl up to the age of 16, even though she might, to a certain extent, have injured her moral character. He asked the Committee not to accept the words proposed.

SIR HENRY JAMES said, he had arrived at the same opinion as his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General, and he hoped these young prostitutes would be kept off the streets. If men knew that it was an offence to speak to them the trade would come to an end. Such girls would be shunned, and would be driven from the streets. For the sake of those children whose deplorable trade would thus come to an end he opposed the Amendment.

CAPTAIN PRICE thought that if they did not accept the Amendment proposed the result would be very serious indeed, especially in certain towns. He represented a large borough, where there was a large garrison, with many soldiers and sailors; and there were many girls of this kind on the streets, many of them being very young girls. Now, it was the trade of these very young girls that Parliament wanted to put a stop to; but the result of legislation of this sort, without proper safeguards, would greatly increase juvenile prostitution, because young girls would not only receive solicitations from men, but would solicit themselves, with this knowledge—that if they did not receive the presents they expected they would always be able to fall back upon extortion. He did not think that any legislation of this kind would destroy juvenile prostitution in their garrison towns. If there was one thing which would discourage juvenile prostitution there, it would be the putting in force again of the Contagious Diseases Acts. Those Acts had a very great effect in those towns in putting a stop to juvenile prostitution; but legislation of this sort would not do it.

MR. HOPWOOD could not accept the view of his hon. and gallant Friend (Captain Price) as to the benefits of the Contagious Diseases Acts, for he (Mr. Hopwood) maintained that they had done much to debase the people, and to place persons in jeopardy from the police.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, order! The hon. and learned Gentleman cannot discuss the Contagious Diseases Acts on this Amendment.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he had no intention of doing so. He was simply answering the remark of the previous speaker, who was allowed to speak without interruption. With reference to the observations which had been made as to driving juvenile prostitution off the streets, he must point out that while many of these girls, who would pass for young women, were much older than they looked, nothing was more common than for those who were really young to put on the simulated appearance of being older. There would be the same number in the streets under this Bill—they would only have to disengage themselves from every remnant of innocence, and they would tramp the streets just as freely and uninterruptedly as before. This would be an extremely dangerous clause. He would ask the Committee to take the case of a young man who had been accosted and decoyed and carried off by a prostitute, and she turned out to be under the age, although she had simulated the appearance of being over it. Were the Committee prepared to say that the girl in such a case should have power to give the young man up to the police, and that he should be sent to gaol, to please a number of people who had raised this outcry, and who believed that purity could be evolved from legislation of this sort? He (Mr. Hopwood) did not believe anything of the sort.

MR. LYULPH STANLEY thought that any magistrate before whom such a case came would judge as to whether the person accused had reasonable cause for believing the girl to be above the age. If she walked the streets and regularly accosted people, inducing them to believe that she was above the age at which it would be a criminal offence to have intercourse with her, there should be no conviction. If that was not so, there ought to be another clause inserted in the Bill, making it criminal for any girl under 16 years of age to ply the trade of a pit-fall.

SIR FARRER HERSCHELL said, nothing could be more scandalous and terrible than the number of very young prostitutes who were upon the streets; and anything that could be done to put a stop to that the Committee would be most desirous of doing. He believed that if the present Amendment were not accepted, the clause would do something to bring this state of things to an end. He did not believe there was any real fear that such cases as had been mentioned would happen.

Amendment *negatived.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) moved, in page 2, line 34, after the word "years," to insert—

> "Or (2.) Unlawfully and carnally knows, or attempts to have unlawful carnal knowledge of, any female idiot, under circumstances which do not amount to rape, but which prove that the offender knew at the time of the commission of the offence that the woman or girl was an idiot."

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. ONSLOW said, he was not quite sure that this Amendment would cover the whole of the cases that ought to be covered. There were many women and girls who ought to be protected who were not exactly idiots. He thought the words "or imbecile" ought to be added. Imbecility was not the same as idiotcy. He proposed that those words be inserted in the Amendment.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment,

In lines 2 and 4, after the word "idiot," to insert the words "or imbecile." — (*Mr. Onslow.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

Mr. Serjeant SIMON moved the omission from the clause of the following Proviso :—

"Provided that it shall be a sufficient defence to any charge under this section if it shall be made to appear to the court, justices, or justice, or magistrate before whom the charge shall be brought that the person so charged had reasonable cause to believe that the girl was of or above the age of fifteen years. If any person is charged before a justice with any crime under this section, no further proceedings shall be taken against such person without the consent of the Attorney General, or by the authority of the Director of Public Prosecutions, except such as the justice may think necessary, by remand or otherwise, to secure the safe custody of such person."

He pointed out that the object of the clause was to protect very young girls against corruption, and to preserve young children from falling into snares which led to their ruin. If any help or assistance were given to those who were the seducers of these young girls, and they were thereby encouraged in criminal practices, the object of the section would be entirely defeated. In an ordinary case of rape there was no provision that would exempt a man from the consequences of his acts, because the person with whom he committed the offence had the appearance of being above the age. It would be a novelty to introduce into the law the proposal contained in the Proviso. He also objected to the provision that no prosecution should be undertaken without the consent of the Attorney General; and he therefore begged to move the omission of the whole Proviso.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 38, to leave out from "Provided" to the end of the Clause.—(*Mr. Serjeant Simon.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he hoped the Committee would not part with the Proviso, or otherwise a girl and her father might induce a man to take the girl into his keeping by persuading him that she was 18 years of age, while she was in reality under 16. It was quite possible that that might be done. Many girls of 16 appeared to be of the age of 18. There might, then, be a deliberate plant, and a girl and those about her might take every conceivable measure to induce a man to believe that she was 18 years of age, and then, when the man had lived with her, she might turn round upon him and say—"I took you in about my age. You can be proceeded against under this section; and unless you pay me £500 I will do it." It was absolutely necessary, therefore, that this protection should remain; and he hoped the Committee would keep it in.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON pointed out that if the Proviso were retained the age of 15 would have to be altered.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, the necessary alteration would of course be made.

Mr. ALBERT GREY contended that the Proviso ought to be omitted; because if a man were able to say that he believed the girl was over the statutory limit, that defence would be made in every case. He hoped the Committee would agree to strike out the Proviso.

Mr. JAMES STUART said, he should have accepted the Proviso but for the suggestion of the hon. Member for South Northumberland (Mr. A. Grey). But, as it was, he thought they were taking too much pains to guard the man. They seemed to be providing that when a man went about vicious practices he should be as free from the liability of punishment as possible. Therefore he desired to see the Proviso struck out from the Bill. He thought that what they were trying to strike at was juvenile prostitution; and if their intention was to protect children of tender age he thought the best course would be to make the offence a distinct misdemeanour, and let the man take his chance. For those reasons he should support the proposal for the omission of the Proviso.

SIR FARRER HERSCHELL said, he thought that hon. Members and others looked at this Bill as likely only to affect those in their class of life. But he would point out that it dealt with the existing social conditions and circumstances under which the vast bulk of the population were compelled to live, and in which it was almost impossible that immorality should not occur. Unfortunately, the people who he referred to herded together in such a manner that, unless human nature were changed, there would always be these cases. He said they must not look at the question solely from the point of view of well-to-do persons. This Bill did not deal with cases of prostitution only; it dealt with every other case of this kind of immorality which might take place with persons in whatever station of life they might be. Unless this safeguard, which the hon. Member for Hackney supposed was only for the protection of men, were retained, they would have this clause operating in the direction of making criminals of those whose only criminality consisted in being compelled to live in the state of society he had described.

MR. JAMES STUART said, he must point out that the observations of the hon. and learned Gentleman who had just spoken were, so far as his Amendment was concerned, quite beside the mark; because the Proviso referred to persons who were unable to distinguish between the true age of a girl and the age they supposed her to be. But in the case of the poorer classes, living, as the hon. and learned Gentleman had said, herded together, it was pretty certain that the age of one would be fairly well known to the other, and the part of the clause they were now dealing with would not affect that class. The argument of the hon. and learned Gentleman was therefore rather against the whole clause, which might operate in the manner he had suggested, than against this particular Proviso, which he (Mr. J. Stuart) said would operate in another direction.

MR. WARTON said, he regretted that the hon. and learned Attorney General was not in his place, because he had to refer to a point of considerable importance. He wished to call attention to what the law had decided in relation to this particular question of age. There had been a case of abduction, where the man was told by the girl that she was 18; the girl looked 18, and yet the man was convicted under the Abduction Clause of the Act of 1881. The very argument was used that there was reason to believe that the girl was 18, and the Judges ruled that, no matter whether the girl looked 18, or said she was 18 years of age, she was not so; and the man was convicted under the clause. The Committee had before them a clause corresponding to the Abduction Clause of the Act of 1881, and he wanted to hear from the Home Secretary whether it was intended to apply the same principle to this case where the age was 16 years.

Question put, and *negatived.*

MR. ALBERT GREY: I distinctly challenged the decision of the Chairman.

MR. JAMES STUART: I also challenged it as loudly as I could.

THE CHAIRMAN: I can only say that the challenges of the hon. Members did not reach my ears.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 38, after the word "under," to insert the words "sub-section one of."—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 40, after the word "magistrate," to insert the words "or jury."—(*Mr. Hopwood.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. COURTNEY said, he should like to know exactly what the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) meant. According to the clause the Court was to have a veto. Was it intended "that the jury should have" a veto also?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): Yes. We agree to the Amendment.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 42, to leave out the word "fifteen" and insert the word "sixteen."—(*Mr. Serjeant Simon.*)

Question proposed, "That 'fifteen' stand part of the Clause."

MR. ALBERT GREY: I propose to move that "fifteen" be omitted, and "eighteen" substituted.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member cannot move that Amendment now. All the hon. Member can do is to support the Amendment to leave out "fifteen."

Question put, and *negatived.*

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member for South Northumberland (Mr. A. Grey) can now move his Amendment to insert "eighteen."

MR. ALBERT GREY said, his object was to make it impossible for a man charged under this clause to come before the Court and say that he believed the girl was over the age mentioned. If they were to allow him to do that it seemed to him that they might as well give up the Bill altogether. But if they were to have anything of the kind he proposed that the man should be able to come forward and say that he believed the girl was 18 years of age.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 42, after the word "of," to insert the word "eighteen."—(*Mr. Albert Grey.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'eighteen' be there inserted."

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he did not wish his hon. Friend the Member for South Northumberland to be under the impression that the Proviso neutralized the clause. His hon. Friend had spoken of it as if a man could come forward and say, "I believe so and so," and that there would then be an end of the case. But there would have to be something shown far stronger than that.

MR. JAMES STUART asked if the words "any reasonable cause" meant that the girl said that she was of or above the age mentioned?

Amendment *negatived.*

Question, "That the word 'sixteen' be inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, as many objections had been made to the first paragraph on page 3 of the Bill, he proposed to leave out the whole of it and insert other words.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT thought it would be best to have the Vexatious Indictment Clause applicable to the whole Act, which provided that a prosecutor should be bound over to prosecute.

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 1, to leave out from "if" to the word "person" in line 6, inclusive.—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he had no objection to make the Vexatious Indictment Clauses apply to the whole Bill.

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 1, to insert—"Every misdemeanour under this section shall in England and Ireland be deemed to be an offence within and subject to the provisions of the Act of the Session of the twenty-second and twenty-third years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter seventeen, intituled an 'Act to prevent vexatious indictments for certain misdemeanours.'"—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SAMUEL SMITH said, he should like the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, in a few words, to explain the operation of the Vexatious Indictment Act.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. STANSFELD said, he was about to move a Proviso which he had taken from the Act of the Home Secretary—the Dangerous Employments Act—and which was strictly applicable to this Bill. It would be preposterous to require, in any such case as was contemplated by the clause, absolute proof of the age of a child apparently 13, 14, or 16 years old. He therefore proposed that where, in the judgment of the Court, the girl was apparently under the age mentioned, it should lie with the person charged to prove that she was over that age.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 42, after the word "years," to insert—"Provided also, That where, in the judgment of such court, justices, or justice, magistrate, the girl is apparently under the age of sixteen years, it shall lie on the person charged to prove that she is of or over that age."—(*Mr. Stansfeld.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, the Government could not assent to the Amendment of the right hon. Member.

MR. WARTON pointed out to the right hon. Member for Halifax that as several alterations had been made in the clause, among others the addition of the word "jury," his Amendment could not possibly be added in its present form.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Householder, &c. permitting defilement of girl under fifteen on his premises guilty of misdemeanour).

CAPTAIN PRICE said, he had an Amendment to move to this clause, the object of which was to make the offender liable to punishment for the graver offence, in the same manner as they had made the offender under the 2nd clause liable for the lesser offence. He hoped his Amendment would commend itself to the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary and the Committee.

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 9, after the word "thereof," to insert the words "induces or knowingly suffers any girl under the age of thirteen years to resort to or be in or upon such premises for the purposes of being unlawfully and carnally known by any man, whether such carnal knowledge is intended to be with any particular man or generally, shall be guilty of felony, and, being convicted thereof, shall be liable, at the discretion of the court, to be kept in penal servitude for life, or for any term not less than five years, or to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour, and any such person who."—(*Captain Price.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. COURTNEY said, he was not sure that the words at the end of the Amendment, "any such person who," were not wrong. It would seem that they referred to any person who did one thing at one time and another at another time.

MR. TOMLINSON suggested that the words "owner or occupier" should be inserted.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT thought that those words would meet the difficulty.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, the clause would run thus—"Any person who"—then would come in the first sub-section proposed by the hon. and gallant Member, and it would follow—

"And any such person who induces or knowingly suffers any girl under the age of fifteen years to resort to or be in or upon such premises for the purpose of being unlawfully and carnally known by any man, whether such carnal knowledge is intended to be with any particular man or generally, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour;"

and so on.

MR. COURTNEY: It would be desirable to amend the Amendment by leaving out the words "and any such person who."

Question, "That those words stand part of the proposed Amendment," put, and *negatived.*

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he had now to move to leave out in page 3, line 10, the word "fifteen," in order to insert "eighteen." Prostitution would always exist; but he did not see why they should not punish a man who harboured them over 21 years of age. Why limit it to 16? They were not protecting young girls, but young women—infants at law. Girls just under 21 had the same right to be under the care and guardianship of the State as girls of 16; and he, therefore, thought it undesirable that they should be able to live in a house with the consent of the proprietor or be prostitutes in the streets.

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 10, to leave out the word "fifteen," and insert the word "twenty-one."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'fifteen' stand part of the Clause."

MR. HOPWOOD said, he could not think that the hon. Member was serious in making this Amendment—in fact, he did not think the hon. Gentleman's action altogether with regard to this Bill was serious. It seemed to him that the hon. Member was anxious, in this singular way, to show the Committee the absurdity of the whole of the Bill, and in that view he (Mr. Hopwood) sympathized with him. This, however, was a serious matter. They were dealing with a friendless class. Surely hon. Members did not desire that those girls should have no place to abide in—that they should have nowhere but the workhouse or the streets to go to, unless it were some hole or den where someone more charitable than that House would let them rest for the night, and let them rot in their diseases. Were they going to say that in the case of a girl above the age of 16 who was already a prostitute no man or woman should shelter her?

["No, no!"] Yes! He would read the words—

> "Induces or knowingly suffers any girl under the age of sixteen years to resort to or be in or upon such premises for the purpose of being unlawfully and carnally known by any man, whether such carnal knowledge is intended to be with any particular man or generally, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour," &c.

Where were those girls to go? Would the hon. Member take them into his house, or would any other charitable person find some place of refuge for them? Why not take to flogging them out of society at once, as was formerly done?—let hon. Members assert their sanctimoniousness to the full. He could not understand what had come over the House of Commons that it should insist upon such hard provisions as these. They would not get these people into the Courts—it would be a question of hiding, and they would have to prey more on the public to get a safe resting place.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) did not understand the purpose of the clause. It was not intended to operate against prostitution in women of adult age; but it was intended to interfere with persons who procured and got to these houses girls of the class, immoral relations with whom had been made penal in a previous clause. It had been made a felony for a man to have to do with a girl under 13 years of age, and a misdemeanour for a man to have to do with a girl under 16 years of age. As a complement to that they must deal with those persons who kept these young girls for purposes of prostitution.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he did not wish to make the profession of saintliness that his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Hopwood) spoke of. His hon. and learned Friend did not understand the Bill. The hon. and learned Gentleman was so indignant with the Bill that he opposed every clause in it, whether right or wrong. He asked whether they intended to let girls under 16 years of age who were living immoral lives die in the gutter? The hon. and learned Gentleman said the object of the clause was to prevent anyone from giving these girls shelter whilst they were pursuing or continuing the profession of prostitution. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) had suggested why he (Mr. Labouchere) should not press his Amendment; and as the Committee would, no doubt, agree with the right hon. Gentleman, he would not go on with the proposal.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, he hoped the Committee would allow the Amendment to be withdrawn, so that he might move to add after the word "girl," "being of or above the age of thirteen years and under the age of sixteen."

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed,

> In page 3, line 10, after the word "girl," to insert the words "being of or above the age of thirteen years and."—(*The Attorney General.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed,

> In page 3, lines 10 and 11, to leave out the word "fifteen," and insert the word "sixteen."—(*The Attorney General.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he desired to move the following Proviso to this clause:—

> "Provided that it shall be a sufficient defence to any charge under this section if it shall be made to appear to the court or jury before whom the charge shall be brought, that the person so charged had reasonable cause to believe that the girl was of or above the age of sixteen."

If this were the proper place for the insertion he would move it—a similar Proviso to that at the end of Clause 5.

Mr. COURTNEY rose to Order. The hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) wished to move an Amendment which would come before that. It was in line 14, after "generally," to insert—

> "Or shall detain the clothes or other property of such girl, or use any threat with intent to compel, or induce her to remain in and upon such premises."

This was to meet the case where a girl went to a house and the people kept her and fed her and refused to let her go, detaining her clothes or using threats to prevent her leaving.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, he should accept the Amendment.

Mr. COURTNEY said, that, however desirable those words might be, he was afraid they could not possibly come in here.

Mr. EDWARD CLARKE said, those words were entirely irrelevant to the purpose of the clause. The clause made it an offence to let a girl be on the premises at all.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he had assented too readily to the Amendment.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, he quite saw the point raised by the hon. and learned Member (Mr. Clarke). He would not propose the Amendment here—it would come in in another place.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he would move the Amendment on the Paper in the name of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), only for "twenty-one" he would substitute "sixteen."

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, after line 17, to insert—"Provided, That it shall be a sufficient defence to any charge under this section if it shall be made to appear to the court or jury before whom the charge shall be brought, that the person so charged had reasonable cause to believe that the girl was of or above the age of sixteen."—(*Sir William Harcourt.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment proposed to the proposed Amendment,

After the word "under," to insert the words "the second sub-section of."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, he did not think that the Proviso applied with equal force to this clause as to Clause 5. Clause 5 contemplated the case of a man who met a girl and might have no proper means of observing what her age was; but Clause 6 contemplated the offence of the procuress. He thought the procuress should be required to take every means to ascertain what the age of the girl was.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that in the case he had put to the Committee the relatives were supposed to desire the prostitution of the girl, and would induce the woman keeping the house to believe that the girl was above the age of 16. The relatives might induce a woman to receive the girl into her house, and then turn round on her afterwards and charge her with having broken the law. The meaning would be the same in the present clause.

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he wished to move the omission of the following words from the clause:—

"A justice of the peace, if satisfied by information made before him on oath by any parent, relative, or guardian of any such girl, or any other person who in the opinion of the justice is bonâ fide acting in the interest of any such girl, that there is reasonable cause to suspect any offence under this section to have been committed in or upon any premises within the jurisdiction of such justice, may grant a warrant under his hand authorising a superintendent or inspector of police, or other officer of police of equal or superior rank, to enter, with such assistance as may be necessary, and if need be by force, and make search in or upon such premises and every part thereof, with a view to the discovery of any offence under this section; and any such superintendent, inspector, or other officer so authorised, may apprehend and bring before two justices, or a police or stipendiary magistrate, any person guilty of an offence under this Act whom he may find upon such premises, and also any girl in respect of whom such offence is charged; and if the justices or magistrate so think fit, they or he may bind over any such girl to appear as a witness on the trial of any such person."

He desired to omit those words in order later on to move the insertion of the following Amendment:—

"If it appears to any justice of the peace, on information made before him on oath by any parent, relative, or guardian of any woman or girl, that there is reasonable cause to suspect that such woman or girl is unlawfully detained for immoral purposes by any person in any place within the jurisdiction of such justice, such justice may issue a warrant authorising any person named therein to search for, and, when found, to take to and detain in a place of safety such woman or girl until she can be brought before a justice of the peace; and the justice of the peace, before whom such woman or girl is brought, may cause her to be delivered up to her parents or guardians, or otherwise dealt with as circumstances may require.

"The justice of the peace issuing such warrant may, by the same or any other warrant, cause any person accused of so unlawfully detaining such woman or girl to be apprehended and brought before a justice, and proceedings to be taken for punishing such person according to law.

"A woman or girl shall be deemed to be unlawfully detained for immoral purposes if she is so detained for the purpose of being unlawfully and carnally known by any man, whether any particular man or generally; and—

(a.) Either is under the age of sixteen years; or

(b.) If of or over the age of sixteen, and under the age of eighteen years, is so detained against her will, or against the will of her father or mother or of any other person having the lawful care or charge of her; or

> (c.) If of or above the age of eighteen years she is so detained against her will:
>
> Any person authorised by warrant under this section to search for any woman or girl so detained as aforesaid may enter (if need be by force) any house, building, or other place specified in such warrant, and may remove such woman or girl therefrom."

His object was to alter the Search Clause in the Bill. The effect would be to enable a parent or guardian who thought that a girl was detained in a house for an immoral purpose to obtain a magistrate's warrant in order to get her out—not so much for the purpose of punishing those who detained her as for the purpose of getting her back. He would move the Amendment *pro formâ.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 18, to leave out from "a justice," to "persons," in line 36.—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. HOPWOOD said, he should not, of course, take any specific objection to the Amendment proposed by the right hon. Gentleman. He merely wished to point out that under the existing law, notwithstanding the incorrect statements made out-of-doors, the magistrates had ample power, in the case of a girl of 14, to send to a house and have the door broken open, if necessary, to have such girl rescued on the ground that a felony had been committed. And when a misdemeanour had been committed in the seduction from her home of a girl between 13 and 16, the magistrates would have ample jurisdiction and could issue a warrant at present. In all these cases, in spite of the great deal that had been said, his contention was that the present law was amply sufficient. Though the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary might have no choice but to yield to the popular cry, yet he thought they were putting on the Statute Book a heap of matter that they could do very well without.

MR. JAMES STUART said, he had Amendments to move to the words the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary proposed to insert.

THE CHAIRMAN: Those Amendments will be considered when we come to deal with the Search Clause. The Question before the Committee is, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. COURTNEY said, he wished to point out that the words the right hon. Gentleman proposed to insert had no reference to the clause the Committee were discussing. No doubt they could be moved as a new clause; but they had nothing to do with the clause before the Committee. This proposition about searching for girls under the age of 16, or over the age of 16 and under the age of 18, or above the age of 18, had no reference to Clause 6 as drawn. It was matter for a new clause—very proper matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): I am willing to bring it up as a new clause. I put it down as an Amendment in order that the two proposals might be read and compared together. I am willing to separate the clauses, or to bring my proposal up as a new clause.

MR. WHITBREAD said, that under the clause if a search were made for one girl, and she was not found on the premises, but another girl were found, that would be an offence under the clause, and she could be brought up together with the persons who had detained her. Under the proposed Amendment only the one girl for whose search the warrant was issued could be brought up. At any rate, that was how it appeared to him.

THE CHAIRMAN: The Question is, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. LYULPH STANLEY: I understood the Home Secretary to say that he proposed to bring up his Amendment in the form of a new clause.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes; but I think the right hon. Gentleman still adheres to his proposal to leave out these words.

Question put, and *negatived.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): The following words, according to the understanding arrived at, should also be omitted:—

> "Every misdemeanor under this section shall in England and Ireland be deemed to be an offence within and subject to the provisions of the Act of the session of the twenty-second and twenty-third years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter seventeen, intituled 'An Act to prevent vexatious indictments for certain misdemeanors.'"

I think we had better strike out all these.

Amendment proposed, in page 3, to leave out from the word "Every," in line 37, to the word "misdemeanours," in line 41.—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Abduction of girl under eighteen with intent to have carnal knowledge) *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Power, on indictment for rape, to convict of indecent assault).

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. STUART-WORTLEY) moved, in pursuance of the arrangement which had been arrived at, to insert after "guilty," in line 11, the words "of a misdemeanour under this Act or."

Amendment proposed,

In page 4, line 11, after the word "guilty," to insert the words "of a misdemeanour under this Act or."—(*Mr. Stuart-Wortley.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Amendment of 2 & 3 Vict., c. 47, s. 54, and 10 & 11 Vict., c. 89, s. 28).

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, it would, perhaps, be well that he should make a statement as to the feelings of the Government in regard to this clause. This clause certainly went into very thorny questions. The object of the Bill was to protect young girls; and although he quite admitted that the law was not in a satisfactory state at the present moment, he was convinced it would take a very long time to argue the points raised by this clause. He therefore hoped the Committee, without argument or a word at all, would allow him to strike the clause out of the Bill. He proposed to raise the question by moving to leave out the words "sub-section eleven."

Amendment proposed, in page 4, line 19, to leave out the words "sub-section eleven."—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he would now move to omit the rest of the clause.

Amendment proposed, in page 4, line 19, to leave out from the word "of" to the end of the Clause.—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Power to exclude women, &c.)

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he might be allowed to make a statement in reference to this clause similar to that the Home Secretary had made upon the preceding clause. By this clause also they entered upon difficult matter, and even upon something foreign to the Bill. The law as it at present stood gave powers sufficient to meet the ends of justice; and, therefore, he begged to move that the clause be struck out of the Bill.

Motion *agreed to.*

Clause *struck out.*

Clause 11 (Prohibition of exclusion from trial, &c. of persons interested) *struck out.*

PART II.

Suppression of Brothels.

Clause 12 (Summary proceedings against brothel keeper, &c.)

MR. LABOUCHERE moved to insert the word "lessor" after "lessee." He did not see why the lessor of the house should not be liable to penalty as well as the lessee. He believed that on the property of the Dean of Christchurch there were more brothels than on any other property in London. The lessor should take care to whom he let his houses, and not allow them to be used as brothels.

Amendment proposed, in page 5, line 27, after the word "lessee," to insert the word "lessor."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'lessor' be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he did not quite understand what the hon. Gentleman meant. Lessor might mean the ground landlord, who might have no control over the property. The person at whom they wished to get by this clause was the occupier of the house—that was to say, the person really in occupation. It would be dangerous to put in the word "lessor" unless there was something to indicate the class of lessor they meant.

MR. GRAY said, he thought the opinion of the Committee ought to be taken on this clause in its entirety, and not upon the addition of the word "lessor." The hon. Gentleman the Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) must be pretty certain that his Amendment would not be accepted. Would it not be better, therefore, to take a discussion upon the clause as a whole? He (Mr. Gray) had not hitherto taken any part in this discussion, though he had watched it closely, and was prepared to state his objections to the clause.

Mr. LABOUCHERE asked the Attorney General if he would be prepared on Report to introduce some words which would define the quality of this clause?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, he would consider the matter; but he was bound to say now that it seemed an exceedingly difficult thing to go further than the tenant, lessee, or occupier of the premises. He would like to meet the case of any lessor who really had control of the premises, and he had no objection to try to do so. He was sure, however, it would be a very difficult task.

Mr. LYULPH STANLEY said, he thought the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) had a little prejudiced his Amendment by the playful allusion he made to the Deans and Chapters. There were lessors who had practical control of property, and it was those people who ought to be got at.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: Do I understand the Attorney General will try to do something in the matter?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster): Yes.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. LABOUCHERE proposed to omit from lines 32 and 33 the words "or in the discretion of the Court," and to insert the word "and." This Amendment was intended to deprive the magistrate or the Judge of the option of fining or imprisoning. Hon. Members knew perfectly well what happened where there was the option to fine or imprison. Rich persons were very frequently fined, and the fine really meant nothing to them. It seemed that a person who offended in this way ought to be imprisoned, and therefore he moved that the magistrate or Judge should have no option.

Amendment proposed,

In page 5, lines 32 and 33, to leave out the words "or in the discretion of the Court," and insert the word "and."—(*Mr. Labouchere.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, he had undertaken a few moments ago to see if he could find words to include the lessor of the premises. Now, if they increased the liability the magistrate ought to have this discretion.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. HOPWOOD proposed to insert after the word "person," in line 18, page 6, the words—

"Shall not be prosecuted under this section except by direction of the local authority in any city, borough, or place, nor."

They might not be the most apt words for the purpose, and he should be glad if better words could be found. He proposed those words so that it should not be a question of a policeman, or even an Inspector, choosing to prosecute in brothel cases. He had a great deal of objection to the clause as it stood; but he fancied that if he allowed that opportunity to slip he would not secure that there should be that control over the prosecution which he thought was desirable. It seemed to him that those who governed in a place—the Municipal Council, or Local Board, or Sanitary Authority, or whatever body it might be—should have the direction of prosecutions contemplated by this clause. He hoped the Government would be able to accept some Amendment of this kind.

Amendment proposed,

In page 6, line 18, after the word "person," to insert the words "shall not be prosecuted under this section except by direction of the local authority in any city, borough, or place, nor."—(*Mr. Hopwood.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he would be glad to adopt some Amendment of this kind; but perhaps the hon. and learned Gentleman would allow him to consider the matter before Report. Only the other day a gentleman wrote to the Home Office complaining of one of these places; he said he had brought it before the Vestry, and although that body were anxious to have this place prosecuted three names were required to be publicly given before the prosecution could be started, and the gentleman who complained was the only one who would give his name.

MR. HOPWOOD thought there was some misunderstanding in regard to this point. There was one mode of prosecuting brothels by which those who prosecuted could secure their costs; but on the ground that the place was a nuisance there was the Common Law right of anybody to prosecute at his own expense. He asked leave to withdraw his Amendment.

MR. GRAY said, that on the Motion to withdraw the Amendment he would like to say that the proposition of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) would meet nearly all the difficulties he (Mr. Gray) had in supporting the clause. He did not deny that some additional powers might be required to deal with disorderly houses; but he thought that if the clause as it now stood were passed a condition of affairs very much worse than that which at present existed would be brought about. At present those who were specially injured by the existence of a disorderly house in their midst must take the initiative; but by the clause as it stood the police were to be the persons who were to deal with the offenders. Now, every disorderly house was known to the police, except possibly a few which need not be taken into consideration, on account of being conducted in a somewhat private manner. He imagined there were from 6,000 to 10,000 disorderly houses in London. Now, was it the intention of the Government, when they introduced this clause, that the police should forthwith prosecute the keepers of the whole of those houses? If not, what was their intention? Was it their intention that the police should discriminate between the offenders, and select just those whom they should prosecute? He supposed that the two right hon. Gentlemen the Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross), and the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt), would be held to be responsible for this Bill. Both of them ought to have some little knowledge of how the police in London did their duty, particularly when they were required to discriminate as to what individuals and what houses should be prosecuted and what individuals and what houses should not be prosecuted. There was the case of Inspector Minahan, in connection with the notorious Jeffries prosecution. Because he did not consent to receive bribes from the owner of this disorderly house Inspector Minahan was persecuted by his superior officers, and he was at last dismissed without a pension. In this matter he (Mr. Gray) addressed himself to the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt). It had been proved that Minahan was right, and his superior officers were wrong and corrupt. Other cases in abundance had occurred in which it had been shown that the police —not merely the ordinary police who received £1 a-week, but the men who received much larger salaries, even those in the very highest positions in the Force, he made no exceptions— were not to be trusted in matters of this kind; that they did not exercise their duties without fear, favour, or affection; but that, on the contrary, they showed both fear, favour, and affection. It was notorious a few years ago, when the West End night houses were constituted such a public nuisance that the whole police of the district were in the pay of the houses, and when the then Home Office, with a zeal which their successors had scarcely emulated, made a really determined effort to deal with the night houses in the Haymarket and neighbourhood, they found that in the first place they had to deal with the police, and that the only thing to be done was to remove the greater number of them to the East End, so corrupt had they become. The punishment of the offenders was utterly out of the question. Now, if the Committee passed a clause of this kind, directing in terms that the police should prosecute all disorderly houses, while at the same time they had no such intention, because they had a full knowledge that to suppress all disorderly houses was a task completely out of their power, what would they do? They would, in fact, direct the police to discriminate as to what offenders they should bring to justice and what offenders they should deliberately allow to escape. They would simply perpetuate the Jeffries rule—namely, that those who paid should be permitted to escape and those who did not pay should be prosecuted. They would have a general adoption of the rule that fashionable offenders should be permitted to get off with a nominal punishment, that the Judges should have secret interviews with their representatives and tell them—"If you plead guilty and suppress all names in Court you will get off with a fine; but if you do not you will have to go to prison." He objected to such a system; it would corrupt the police, it would corrupt the public. There had been quite enough of it, and the Committee ought to set their faces against it, instead of deliberately encouraging it. If the Bill was not to apply to Ireland he would be quite content to leave to Members for English constituencies the task of framing such laws as they thought suitable to the peculiar condition of affairs which they were told existed in this great and Christian Metropolis. Now, in Dublin the police were not under the control of the people. The right hon. Gentleman (Sir R. Assheton Cross) would remember that when he sat in Dublin as one of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into the Housing of the Working Classes, some evidence was given as to the existence of disorderly houses in Dublin. Complaint was made of the increase of such houses, and the witnesses said, and he believed said truly, that the population of Dublin would be very willing to submit to more stringent laws for the better regulation of disorderly houses and disorderly characters; but they made this proviso—that the regulations must be made and carried out by officers of the Local Authority, and not by officers of the Imperial Government; they said the people of the City would readily submit to any regulations for this purpose made by their own representatives, but they would not submit or tolerate any autocratic interference by the Imperial Government. He quite admitted that if one-tenth of the disclosures which had been made within the last few weeks with regard to the condition of affairs in London was true, anything the Committee did was justified. London was so abominably bad, according to their own account, that nothing they could propose was too strict to remedy the atrocious state of affairs disclosed. But, putting London aside, the representatives of the people in all the English towns would have the enforcement of this clause; and, under such circumstances, it might be reasonably conjectured that local abuses would be remedied from time to time. In Ireland it would be totally different. Power would be given to an Imperial Force over which local opinion would have no kind of control. The people of the Irish towns would regard with strong dissatisfaction the passing into the hands of the police of further power in connection with this matter. But if the Proviso of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) were adopted, and the initiative were given to Local Authorities, he (Mr. Gray) would offer no objection to the clause. It must be borne in mind that, in regard to London and other large cities, it was proposed to make a crime what was not now a crime, but a matter which was to be remedied at the instance of the persons particularly injured by the existence of disorderly houses in their midst. It was proposed to make a general crime. All those who committed that crime could not possibly be prosecuted for it; and, therefore, he thought it was a dangerous precedent for Parliament to teach the police that they were to have full personal knowledge of the persons committing a legal crime, and that they were to use their discretion as to who they prosecuted. The most that could be done was to reach 1 per cent of the criminals. As far as London was concerned, he cared little whether the task was attempted or not—it did not concern him very much—but what he wanted to secure was that in Ireland, where the circumstances were totally different, where the existence of vice was not so rampant as here, but where it was acknowledged that better provision for the regulation of disorderly houses might be made, the exercise of the powers sought to be given by this clause should not be entrusted to an Imperial Force, but to a force over which the representatives of the people had control. He protested against such a clause as this being extended to Ireland simply because the House had been frightened by an agitation which had been started by a newspaper within the last week or so, and because right hon. Gentlemen on both Front Benches were extremely anxious to get rid of any further disagreeable questions on the subject.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he was glad that the hon. Member (Mr. Gray) had made in the House the statement which had been made elsewhere with reference to the police. To that statement he desired to give an absolute contradiction. Speaking of Inspector Minahan, the hon. Gentleman said it had been proved that Minahan was dismissed from the Force in connection with the Jeffries case, and that Minahan was right in charging the police with corruption in that matter. In the first place, Minahan was not dismissed from the Force in connection with the Jeffries case. The charge against Minahan was that of general insubordination. ["Oh, oh!"] He was speaking what he knew. Hon. Members had read statements in a newspaper which were absolutely untrue, and for which there was not a colour of foundation. It was in the year 1883 that Minahan, who had been an insubordinate officer, who had been removed from one district to another on account of his misconduct, and expressed his gratitude for having been so leniently treated, brought something like 15 charges against his superior officers, only one of which had any reference to Jeffries. The 15 charges were examined and found to be entirely untrue from first to last. Having made the charges, he was told, as a matter of discipline, that a man who was guilty of that general insubordination could no longer hold high rank in the police. He was degraded in his rank, whereupon he resigned, and that was a year and a-half before the trial of the Jeffries case. It was after he had left the Police Force, and as a means, he (Sir William Harcourt) believed, of forcing his way back again, that he took up the Jeffries case. ["Oh, oh!"] Again, he was stating the absolute facts of the case. Hon. Members below the Gangway were so constantly in the habit of attacking the police and everybody connected with the administration of justice in Ireland, that it seemed they could not refrain from doing the same in England. They might attack him (Sir William Harcourt) as much as they liked—he was there to defend himself. But he did not think that the charges which had been brought against him of having taken part in these transactions would receive any countenance either in or out of the House. He felt bound to speak for the police, because if the charges against them were to be sown broadcast as they were being sown the people would have no faith in the Force. If the police were to be discredited on the authority of a discharged officer, who was going round collecting subscriptions for himself, and setting up the charge that all the police, from the highest to the lowest, were corrupt, and took bribes from brothel keepers, the Force must be disbanded. The hon. Gentleman (Mr. Gray) had said that everyone in the Force, even those in the highest positions, were corrupt.

MR. GRAY said, the right hon. Gentleman was mistaken in supposing that everyone in the Force was corrupt.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that that was a charge which ought not to be made. It could not be proved; there was no foundation at all for it. He had seen it stated that he refused to examine into the case, but allowed the Chief Commissioner to make the inquiry. Who else was to make the inquiry he should like to know? If a soldier or officer was insubordinate, and there was a military inquiry, was it to be said there was no inquiry, and everybody up to the Commander-in-Chief was partial and corrupt in the matter? Now, with reference to prosecutions generally. The hon. Member (Mr. Gray) said there was to be a selection, as there was in the Jeffries case. The hon. Gentleman assumed that the police had something to do with the prosecution of Jeffries. The police had nothing to do with that prosecution. ["Oh!"] He repeated that the police had nothing to do with that prosecution. It was taken up by a different authority altogether. The case was taken up by an Association for the protection of young girls, and if it was hushed up it was hushed up by that Association. The prosecution was absolutely in the hands of that Association, one of the leading members of which was a person named Mr. Benjamin Scott, who he saw had attacked him the other evening. If the case was hushed up, therefore, it was hushed up by Mr. Scott. For his part, he never heard of the prosecution at all, and never knew of it until the whole case was over, and until the attacks were made by Minahan against the police. Then he investigated the charges that Minahan had made, and he came to the conclusion that they were absolutely false. That was the whole case against the police and against him, and that was the ground on which the charges were made against the authorities of hushing up this case. That was the way in which these things were worked up—without the slightest regard for truth. If they would believe the word of a discharged policeman against the testimony of the whole body of the police, the magistrates, and the Secretary of State, they would believe anything. He had stated all the facts as accurately as he knew them. He said that the case never came before them, the Home Officer knew nothing of it, and the police made no charge whatever. It was in the hands of an Association; and as for the charge made by Minahan against the police, there was, as far as he knew, no foundation whatever. Having disposed of that matter, he would now touch upon the other question raised by the Amendment. The hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray) said he would not trust the police in dealing with these matters. Well, for his part, he thought it was not desirable that the police should be mixed up in such questions as the Bill dealt with. He quite agreed that the Local Authorities should be the people to make charges in these cases; and he thought that the clause ought to provide a simpler method and a more summary procedure for dealing with these matters. He believed that these general charges against the police had utterly and entirely broken down—he did not say that no case of corruption had ever occurred amongst the 12,000 men in the Police Force. But, when they did happen, how were they dealt with? The hon. Member knew that where there was the slightest suspicion of a case it was fully inquired into at once. Some time ago he himself wrote a Memorandum to the Commissioners of Police, in which he directed that, where there was the slightest suspicion of anything of this sort, it should be fully inquired into, and, if found to be well founded, should be punished severely. If the hon. Member was under the impression that offences of that kind were winked at, he was very much mistaken. Whenever they were found out they were punished, and he did not think it should be allowed to go forth that the police were in the habit of receiving bribes in these cases. He did not think such a statement was true, and he believed there was no foundation whatever for the suggestion that the police trafficked in these matters. In order to keep them out of every sort of temptation and suspicion, however, perhaps it might be well not to extend these powers to them.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he did not wonder, after the remarks of the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray), that the right hon. Gentleman had felt called upon to enter at some length into the subject on which he had spoken. He only regretted that his remarks had not been made at an hour when they could have been reported, as they furnished a perfect and conclusive defence of the Police Force. He would point out, however, that if they were to go on discussing these matters at length, it would be exceedingly inconvenient. This case did not really arise on this clause, and he ventured to hope that the Committee might now be allowed to go on with the discussion of the clause.

Mr. COURTNEY said, he was afraid that this discussion would not close as soon as the Chancellor of the Exchequer imagined, or as he himself would desire; and, therefore, he thought it would be as well if they reported Progress now, in order to allow the remainder of the discussion on the Bill to be taken at a reasonable hour. He would not make a Motion to that effect at present; but he thought the Committee was not in a condition to discuss the new clauses that night.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Courtney.*)

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) thought the suggestion was a reasonable one, and when they came to the end of the Bill, as it stood, they would report Progress. Perhaps the hon. Member would allow him to take the Exemption Clause that night.

Mr. COURTNEY would not press his point.

Mr. MOLLOY thought they ought to report Progress. He believed that the charges of corruption made against the police were true.

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out to the hon. Member that the Question before the Committee was that Progress should be reported.

MR. MOLLOY thought he was adhering to that Question. There were a great many things to discuss in connection with this matter, and he thought they ought to report Progress. There were a great many things to be said with regard to the police, and he would strongly urge the Home Secretary to adopt his suggestion, so as to enable them to continue the discussion tomorrow.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, perhaps the hon. Gentleman would allow him to point out that if it had not been for the nature of the charge which had been brought forward by the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray), he would have risen long ago to have asked whether the discussion which had been going on was in Order. It appeared to him that neither the speech of the hon. Member nor that of the right hon. Gentleman were in Order.

MR. MOLLOY said, he knew nothing about this question before that evening; but the great question now was whether these powers were to be left in the hands of the police or put into those of the Local Authorities?

THE CHAIRMAN: I have already pointed out to the hon. Member that the Question before the Committee is that I report Progress, and ask leave to sit again. I must request the hon. Member to confine his remarks to that Question.

MR. MOLLOY said, he was only pointing out to the right hon. Gentleman the necessity of reporting Progress.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. HOPWOOD said, he had a few words to say on this clause before it was adopted. It was ridiculous for the Committee to go on in this Puritanical fashion. As he understood it, this clause was merely to give facilities for breaking down the houses where these loose women took refuge. If it only applied to cases where it could be proved that they were a nuisance to the neighbourhood, then he had nothing more to say; but he did protest against a wholesale attempt to drive out these unfortunate women, as had been done in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and other places. It only distributed the evil and spread bad example.

CAPTAIN PRICE said, he hoped the Government would be induced to withdraw the clause altogether. It was a most mischievous one. Was it to be carried out in a half-and-half manner, or was it to be carried out in its entirety? If it was to be carried out in a half-and-half manner, it would be of no use at all; and if it was to be carried out in its entirety, the effect would be to flood the streets with prostitutes. He believed, to a great extent, in the system adopted in other countries. He was not altogether an advocate of the principle of registering houses of ill-fame, and so giving official recognition of that kind of thing; but he thought their streets were much more free in consequence of their not hunting these women about, as it was now proposed to do in England.

MR. MOLLOY asked whether it was clearly understood that the police were in no way to have the initiative in these prosecutions? He would give his reasons for asking this question. The late Home Secretary had made a great deal out of the statement that the police were not in the habit of receiving bribes from these people. Now, he would call attention to the case of the Argyll Rooms, when they were open, and appeal to those who knew what London life was at the time. It was well known at the time that they were kept open as a place where prostitutes met men about town, yet every licensing day the police agreed to the lie that the rooms were not frequented by loose characters, and that there were no improper characters going there without gentlemen. Well, every man about town knew that those statements were deliberate untruths. It was a matter of notoriety at the time, and it was equally notorious now, that the police did, in many cases—he did not say in all—receive bribes from the keepers of brothles. Do not let those who knew London at night try to pretend to each other that they did not know these things. It was a monstrous farce for them to talk to each other as though they did not know these things. Let him give an example. A short time ago there was an order issued, and 40 women were taken by the police from the streets near Waterloo Place. Well, when he came out of his club the very night afterwards he himself saw the same policemen who had apprehended some of the women talking and chatting with them in the most friendly manner. There was no doubt that there were a great many good men amongst these policemen; but if they put these temptations in their way they could not expect anything else to happen but what he had described. They ought to make them the protectors of the public, and not the institutors of prosecutions.

Sir ROBERT FOWLER (Lord Mayor) said, he did not see how they could exclude the police altogether from these cases.

The CHAIRMAN said, the discussion was going a little wide of the clause, which contained nothing on this subject.

Sir ROBERT FOWLER (Lord Mayor) said, he would not detain the Committee; but he did not see how they could prosecute brothels unless they took the evidence of the police.

Mr. EDWARD CLARKE said, he hoped that the Home Secretary would not put words into the clause which would exclude the police altogether. It might be proper not to allow them to institute prosecutions; but it would be a very serious thing to exclude them altogether.

Mr. JAMES STUART said, he was altogether opposed to giving the police the power of instituting proceedings against these women. It would be placing an unfair temptation in the way of the police; and he could not help suspecting that those who had the control of the Force must feel very great doubt and hesitation with regard to putting these powers in their hands. He was altogether opposed to the police instituting anything against brothels and prostitutes.

Mr. GRAY said, he did not wish to pursue the discussion at that moment; but he ventured to say that there might be some few people here and there who would not think the late Home Secretary's statement so absolutely convincing as he seemed to think. For his part, he had always held the opinion that the police were an exceedingly useful and able body of men; but in stating what he had done he had simply related facts which were notorious. He had not intended to make any general charge against the Police Force beyond this—that they were ordinary human beings, exactly the same as hon. Members all were; and if temptations like those held out to the police were held out to them they would probably succumb as any of the police would give way. Where was there anything in the clause to show that the initiative was not to be taken by the police? The keeping of these houses was declared to be illegal under the Summary Jurisdiction Act; but there was not one word in regard to the institution of proceedings; and if the police were not to initiate who was to? Where was there any person but the police given the power of instituting these proceedings?

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he could answer that at once.

Mr. GRAY pointed out that if the right hon. Gentleman could do so it would shorten the discussion materially. All he was anxious for was that the police should have nothing to do with these matters.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, the police were not prosecutors at all, and when they did do so it was only for general convenience. They were not supposed to prosecute in any case, and their doing so was only for convenience. If it was desired to exclude them absolutely, then some words should be put in to that effect. He would have no objection whatever to that course. He had always thought it better to keep them out of these matters. He was not responsible for the actual drafting of the clause; but certainly the object of it was, not to alter the existing prosecuting authorities, who were the Local Authorities, but to enable the magistrates to exercise a summary jurisdiction.

Clause *agreed to.*

Part III.

Definitions and Miscellaneous.

Clause 13 (Definitions) *agreed to.*

Clause 14 (Application of Act to Scotland).

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) proposed to omit line 34—namely—" The expression

'Attorney General' shall mean Lord Advocate."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 15 (Costs).

MR. HASTINGS proposed, in page 7, line 9, after the word "Act," to insert the words "or any case of indecent assault."

Amendment *agreed to.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) proposed to insert, after the word "prosecution," in line 10, the words "in the same manner as in cases of felony."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 16 (Repeal of enactments in Schedule) *agreed to.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) moved, after Clause 14, to insert the following clause:—

(Saving clause as to liability to other criminal proceedings.)

"This Act shall not exempt any person from any proceeding for an offence which is punishable at common law, or under any Act of Parliament other than this Act, so that a person be not punished twice for the same offence."

Clause *brought up,* and read the first and second time, and *added* to the Bill.

New Clause (Vexatious indictments,) —(*Sir R. Assheton Cross,*)—*brought up,* and read the first and second time, and *added* to the Bill.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) proposed the new clause (Power of Search). He simply wished to move the second reading in order that it might appear on the Orders.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Committee report Progress; to sit again upon *Monday* next.

TELEGRAPH ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Hibbert.*)

[BILL 121.] THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read, and *discharged.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect of Clause 2."—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre.*)

MR. ALDERMAN W. LAWRENCE proposed that the Bill be re-committed in order to introduce two new clauses. The object of the clauses he wished to introduce was that the initials of the Metropolitan districts should not be counted as words, and that the names of streets, gardens, squares, parks, crescents, crosses, lanes, and so forth, and the names of islands, bays, harbours, levels, and so forth, should be counted as one word only.

Amendment proposed, to add, at the end of the Question, the words "and in respect of two new clauses."—(*Mr. Alderman W. Lawrence.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, it was quite impossible for him to accept either of the alterations suggested by the hon. Gentleman.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Main Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *re-committed* in respect of Clause 2; *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE proposed to omit from line 30 "1*d.* for each additional two words, or parts of words," for the purpose of inserting "½*d.* for each additional word."

Amendment proposed,

In Clause 2, line 30, to leave out the words "1*d.* for each additional two words, or parts of words," and insert "½*d.* for each additional word."—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Bill *reported,* with an Amendment; as amended, *considered.*

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE hoped the House would now read the Bill the third time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre.*)

MR. ALDERMAN W. LAWRENCE hoped the right hon. Gentleman the late Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) would consider whether names of streets should not in all cases be charged as one word only. He could not see why Piccadilly, which had 10 letters in it, should be charged as one word, while Pall Mall, in which there were only eight letters, should be charged as two words. The refusal to make the alterations he suggested would cause great irritation to many persons.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

EAST INDIA (ARMY PENSIONS DEFICIENCY) BILL.—[Bill 255.]

(*Sir Henry Holland, Colonel Walrond.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir Henry Holland.*)

Mr. ONSLOW said, this was a very important Bill, affecting, if he mistook not, the Revenue of India. It was only delivered that day, and as hon. Members had not had an opportunity of examining it, perhaps the hon. Baronet would explain its provisions.

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Sir Henry Holland) said, a certain number of pensions, which fell due before the new arrangement with regard to pensions was made in 1884, had to be paid by this country. The pensions which had fallen due since that arrangement were annually paid by India. For the pensions which fell due before 1884, there was no more money coming from India; but there was about £1,600,000 in hand to meet them. When that sum was exhausted, the pensions would form a charge upon the Army Vote. That would raise the Army Vote very unfairly, and therefore it had been thought right to borrow from the Consolidated Fund a sum of money to lighten the Estimates. The charge would cease when the pensions came to an end. Annual accounts would be presented to Parliament.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Monday* next.

EAST INDIA (ARMY PENSIONS DEFICIENCY) [CREATION OF ANNUITY].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the creation of an Annuity of One hundred and fifty thousand pounds, chargeable on the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, towards discharging the liability of the Consolidated Fund in respect of certain Indian Army Pensions.

Resolution to be reported upon *Monday* next.

House adjourned at twenty minutes after Three o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 3rd August, 1885.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Registration Appeals (Ireland) * (226); Expiring Laws Continuance * (229); Telegraph Acts Amendment * (230); Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) * (231).

Committee—Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) * (190); Evidence by Commission * (212-228).

Committee—Report—Pluralities * (213); Customs and Inland Revenue (No. 2) * (220); Lunacy Acts Amendment * (221).

Committee—Report—Third Reading—Patent Law Amendment * (223), and *passed.*

Report—River Thames (No. 2) (218).

Third Reading—Public Health (Scotland) Provisional Order (No. 2) * (188); Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) * (209), and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Scottish and Irish Peerages (10).

SCOTTISH AND IRISH PEERAGES BILL.—(No. 10.)

(*The Lord Waveney.*)

BILL WITHDRAWN.

Lord WAVENEY, in asking the leave of the House to withdraw the Bill, said, that it had been introduced in order to provide a remedy for the anomalies that arose from the present system of electing Representative Peers for Scotland and Ireland. He considered it a great and positive evil that the two Kingdoms of Scotland and Ireland should be represented by a close corporation in that House. The question of Peerages in their Lordships' House had been considered on various occasions; but it had never been fairly considered in regard to the important point raised in the Bill. Under the existing arrangement, all the Peers elected generally belonged to one side in politics—that, namely, of the majority, or the Conservative Party. Peers who belonged to the minority, or the Liberal Party, had no chance of being represented, or of getting into the House, except by being created Peers of the

United Kingdom, in which case they had to sink the old historic names by which they were known and distinguished. That was an unsatisfactory state of matters, which was never intended, and which required to be remedied. He recognized the impossibility of getting the Bill through that Session, and therefore thought it more respectful to their Lordships to formally withdraw it, than to allow it to remain any longer on the Paper. He thought it would be well, however, if their Lordships were to bear in mind and see whether a system could not be devised that would do away with the existing anomalies in connection with the Peerages of Ireland and Scotland. The constitution of the House of Lords was at present a subject of popular discussion; and he thought that made it all the more desirable that their Lordships themselves, and of their own accord, should apply themselves to the remedying of any defects that were found to exist, instead of waiting until pressure was brought to bear on them from without. Their Lordships would recollect a very remarkable gathering that recently took place in Hyde Park. He never saw a more good-natured assembly or a more representative body of men; but, under the influence of popular excitement, a good-humoured crowd of that description might easily degenerate into an unruly mob. As he had said, the evil was a very serious one, and ought to be dealt with by their Lordships. He would give Notice that he would bring the Bill forward again next year.

LORD HOUGHTON said, he thought their Lordships were indebted to his noble Friend (Lord Waveney) for calling attention to this important subject. He hoped his noble Friend would carry out his intimation, and that the Bill would be brought forward again at the first opportunity.

Bill (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

RIVER THAMES (No. 2) BILL.—(No. 218.)

(*The Lord Mount-Temple.*)

REPORT.

Amendments *reported* (according to Order).

THE EARL OF ABINGDON moved an Amendment in Clause 4, giving the Conservators power to hear complaints as to unreasonable delay of boats in front of the property of riparian owners.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

LORD MOUNT-TEMPLE moved an Amendment, providing that the byelaws of the Conservancy for the regulation of traffic on the Thames should not allow house-boats or other boats to remain for more than 48 hours at anchor in front of a residence. At present, a serious nuisance was caused to owners of houses on the banks of the Thames by boats being moored for weeks and and months in front of these residences. At regattas and on other occasions the public would be deprived of much of their present enjoyment if arbitrary power were bestowed on occupiers of houses to prevent any temporary loitering at their banks.

Amendment *moved,* in Clause 6, page 3, line 7, after ("ground") to insert ("for more than forty-eight hours.")—(*The Lord Mount-Temple.*)

LORD BRAMWELL maintained that the owners of these boats had no right to loiter opposite to the residences of riparian owners at all, and on that ground he opposed the Amendment. It would be an intolerable nuisance for a boat—especially a house-boat, with, perhaps, many persons on board—to stop in front of a gentleman's garden for 48 hours. They might as well give gipsies power to camp for that time on the high road in front of a dwelling-house.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS also opposed the Amendment. He would point out to their Lordships that there might be a succession of boats each staying 48 hours.

THE EARL OF ABINGDON said, he supported the Amendment in the interests of riparian owners, a committee of whom had come to the conclusion that they would rather have a summary jurisdiction power of removing boats after 48 hours than be left, as at present, with the alternative of a Common Law action, which, in all probability, would not be tried until months after the order for removal had ceased to be of any practical benefit.

LORD MOUNT-TEMPLE explained that house-boats were used by artists, lovers of nature who would have no enjoyment if they were not permitted to loiter. As it was, these boats were often moored opposite a house for as long a period as three months. All the riparians knew very well that they had better have the boats removed at the end of 48 hours.

LORD **BRAMWELL** said, he thought the owners of boats ought to be liable to a penalty if they stayed opposite a house at all.

THE EARL OF **ABINGDON** believed that they had a right to loiter.

LORD **BRAMWELL** said, they had not.

On Question? Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 20; Not-Contents 14: Majority 6.

Resolved in the *affirmative*.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to*.

Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow*.

REGISTRATION APPEALS (IRELAND) BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to accelerate the hearing of appeals under the Acts relating to the registration of voters in Ireland in the year one thousand eight hundred and eighty-five—Was *presented* by The Earl BEAUCHAMP; read 1ª; to be *printed*; to be read 2ª *To-morrow*; and Standing Order No. XXXV. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with. (No. 226.)

PRIVATE BILLS.

Standing Orders Nos. 10., 22., 52., 57., 64., 85., 114., 115., 134., and 179., *considered* and *amended*; and to be *printed* as amended. (No. 227.)

House adjourned at Six o'clock, till To-morrow, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 3rd August, 1885.

MINUTES.]—SELECT COMMITTEE — *Report* — Admiralty (Expenditure and Liabilities) [No. 311].

PRIVATE BILL (*by Order*)—*Considered as amended — Third Reading*—Edinburgh Extension and Sewerage,* and *passed*.

PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Infants [157].

Report of Select Committee—Earldom of Mar Restitution * [256].

Lord Mount-Temple

Committee—Secretary for Scotland [242]—R.P

Committee—Report—Criminal Law Amendment [159-257]; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation); Public Works Loans [254]; East India (Army Pensions Deficiency) * [225]; Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2) [68].

Committee—Report—Third Reading—Ecclesiastical Commissioners (No. 2)* [253], and *passed*.

Report — Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) * [233].

QUESTIONS.

——o——

PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—KINGSTOWN PIER.

MR. **MAURICE BROOKS** asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether he is aware that, in certain conditions of the wind, considerable avoidable inconvenience is caused to the Irish travelling public, including numerous Members of Parliament, by the lack of protection and shelter from rain and storm when shipping and landing as passengers between Kingstown and Holyhead; whether he is aware that the contractors for the carriage of Her Majesty's Mails between Holyhead and Kingstown have repeatedly applied for works to be carried out at the Carlisle Pier, Kingstown, and the Royal Mail Packet Jetty, Holyhead, which they state to be necessary for the protection of the Mail Packets, and for the shelter and convenient landing and shipping of Mails and passengers; and, whether he can state what steps he proposes to take to meet the wants complained of?

THE **SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY** (Sir HENRY HOLLAND): Sir, no complaints have been made, except by the Packet Company, of the lack of protection to passengers at this harbour; and, so far as I am aware, there is no obligation upon the Government, either by their contracts or otherwise, to provide improved accommodation for passengers there. As regards the second part of the Question, I answered a similar one a week ago relating to Holyhead. In the case of Kingstown, the Packet Company, if they think there is any risk, should apply to the Board of Works in Dublin, in whom the harbour is vested, and who would, no doubt, ascertain whether the present state of things affords reasonable security to the mail packets.

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—THE CIRCUIT ARRANGEMENTS.

MR. WARTON asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether his attention has been called to the following observations of Mr. Justice Grove, made on Saturday the 25th July, during the trial of the case of the Triumph Steamship Company (Limited) v. the Dartmouth Harbour Commissioners, viz.:—

> "It was hardly possible to exaggerate the inconvenience of the present system. He had just learned that on Monday he had to sit in banco, on Tuesday he could go on with this case, which, however, would probably not finish on that day. On Wednesday he believed he should have to sit at the Old Bailey, and how long he would be detained there he had no idea. All he could therefore say was, that the further hearing must stand over until Tuesday;"

and, whether he will consider the propriety of recommending such an increase in the number of Judges as will permit of the continuance de die in diem of trials in the Queen's Bench Division? The hon. and learned Gentleman also asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether his attention has been called to the following observations of Mr. Baron Huddleston, made on the 29th July at Chelmsford, viz.:—

> "He was sorry that the new system under which the Assizes were held proved so inconvenient, and that, owing to the amount of business he had to go through at Norwich and other towns, he had been obliged to alter the dates for holding the Assizes at Chelmsford, Hertford, and Lewes; and even now, if he could not obtain the assistance of a Commissioner to whom he had made application for help, he was afraid he must again alter his present arrangements, for the two remaining Judges were obliged to stay in London, one taking work at Chambers, and the other being engaged with criminal business at the Old Bailey. He also referred to the great expense that the special jurors, petty jurors, and witnesses were put to at having to remain in the town for so long a time, owing to one judge having to take both civil and criminal business;"

and, whether he will consider the propriety of recommending such an increase in the number of Judges as will permit of the business at the Assizes being conducted with a due regard to the convenience of suitors, jurors, and witnesses?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER), in reply, said, that these Questions should have been addressed to his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department; but, after communicating with the right hon. Gentleman, he (the Attorney General) might say that the arrangements for the business of the Circuits, and also for the sittings in London, lay with the Judges themselves, who would now, as in the past, consider the interests of suitors and all concerned. The question of increasing the number of Judges, to which the hon. and learned Gentleman who put the Question referred, was one involving numerous and serious considerations, and could only be done by legislation.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS—PLEURO-PNEUMONIA (IRELAND).

MR. CLARE READ asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will state the number of cases of pleuro-pneumonia in cattle reported in the three Dublin Unions during the first six months of the present year; the number reported in the rest of Ireland; and also the number in Great Britain during that period; and, if the special means taken by Lord Spencer to eradicate the disease from Dublin have been attended with any success, and if the stringent inspection of cowhouses in that city will be continued?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): Sir, the number of cases in the Unions of the county of Dublin was 877; in the rest of Ireland 24; and in Great Britain 657. There is no intention of relaxing the special measures adopted by Lord Spencer to eradicate the disease from the Dublin district, as they could not be dispensed with without inconvenience and danger. It is believed that the result will be most satisfactory; but it is hardly time yet to judge of the full effect.

REGISTRY OF DEEDS (IRELAND) ACT, 1883.

MR. FINDLATER asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether he is aware that the operation of the Registry of Deeds (Ireland) Holidays Act of 1883 has been practically defeated by the action of the Treasury in deducting from the ordinary leave of the clerks a number of days equal to the number of holidays conferred by the Act; and, whether he will undertake that in future the clerks shall enjoy not only the holidays created by the Act of Parliament, but also the same amount of annual leave as they were entitled to prior to the passing of the said Act?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND): The hon. Member put a similar Question on March 31, 1884, and the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) then answered that the object of the Act referred to was to enable this office to be closed on the same days as other offices. The staff now get legally altogether 36 week days' leave in the year, which, in the opinion of the Registrar, and also that of the Treasury, is quite sufficient, and as much as is allowed in analogous positions.

ARMY—THE ROYAL IRISH FUSILIERS.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Secretary of State for War, The number of days the Adjutant of the Fusiliers was absent with and without leave from the termination of the training of 1884 to the commencement of the training of 1885, and by whom were the Regimental duties performed during his absence; and, if an immense saving to the Military expenditure of the Country could be effected by dispensing with the services of those Adjutants attached to Regiments where the head quarters are apart from the Regimental depôts?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): Sir, the officer referred to has had, since the training of 1884, his ordinary annual leave, and, in addition, has been absent by permission of his commanding officer on certain occasions from Saturday to Monday. There is no record of any absence without leave. During the Adjutant's absence the Quartermaster performed his duties. The Adjutants of detached Militia regiments act as recruiting officers, and for that and other reasons could not be dispensed with without serious inconvenience.

POST OFFICE CLERKS.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Postmaster General, Whether clerks who have been obliged to serve from ten to fifteen years in provincial offices, and are transferred to the larger offices through the reduction of the clerical staff of the office to which they were attached, or from any other cause, are placed at great disadvantages in may respects in the offices to which they have been transferred, by being made to rank as junior to other clerks with several years less service, but who have been attached to those offices from the date of their appointment; will he state what steps he is prepared to take to assure, as in other branches of the Civil Service, to clerks or others who are transferred from one office to another at the instance of the Post Office Department, or at their own request, a due recognition of their service by granting to them all those rights to which by seniority they are entitled; and, whether it is part of the system to subject members of the lower grades of the Service to loss of revenue on transfer from one office to another without granting them compensation?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord JOHN MANNERS): As a general rule, I may say that clerks transferred from one office to another enter their new office below those who are already there; but, even so, a transfer is, as a rule, to their advantage, because in the larger offices there are prospects which the smaller ones do not afford. In no case does an officer, by reason of his transfer, sustain loss of income.

ALKALI, &c. WORKS REGULATION ACTS—GAS WORKS.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether the provisions of the Alkali Act can be extended to gasworks, so that the preventible nuisances arising from gas manufacture may be stopped; and, whether his attention has been directed to the gasworks at Tunbridge Wells, in which the annual production of 600 tons of foul lime and oxide of iron has been abolished?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR): When the manufacture of sulphate of ammonia is carried on in connection with gas works, that process is under inspection under the Alkali, &c. Works Regulation Act. As regards gas works generally, of which there are about 2,000, the nuisance which occasionally occurs is one that can be dealt with by the local Inspector of

Nuisances, and it is not at present considered necessary to extend to them the provisions of the Act referred to. We are aware that at the gas works at Tunbridge Wells the process which is known as the "Cooper Lime Process" has been adopted, this process, like certain others, being intended to assist in the purification of gas.

ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE.

Mr. BERESFORD asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he would have any objection to lay upon the Table of the House the names of the Medical Officers of the Army who have returned from Foreign service within the last three years, with the dates of their proceeding on Foreign service again; and, to state the length of Home service of each Medical Officer?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith): I am not prepared to lay on the Table the Return asked for. It is obviously impossible to convey to the House, in the form of a Return, all the circumstances attending an officer's service abroad, or of the emergency that may in certain cases necessitate the curtailment of his service at home. I may add that, as Secretary of State for War, I hold myself responsible generally that the roster and system of relief are fairly worked.

POST OFFICE—INSURANCE OF PARCELS.

Sir ROBERT FOWLER (Lord Mayor) asked the Postmaster General, Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to undertake the insurance of parcels and packages when in transit through the Post Office, even if these packages include articles of commercial importance, such as bonds, securities, and diamonds; and, if so, on what conditions, and on payment of what premiums, these insurances will be effected; and, whether the same ad valorem Stamp Duty, as is paid in respect of insurances of such packages at the present time when forwarded to the Continent, Channel Islands, or Ireland, will be paid by the Postmaster General to Her Majesty's Treasury?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord John Manners): In answer to my right hon. Friend I have to state that, although the principle of the insurance of parcels has been settled, the details are still under consideration. Some articles will probably be excepted from the proposed arrangement, the general conditions of which will be that the Postmaster General, who is now legally exempt from liability for loss or damage, will accept such liability without specific payment up to 20*s.* a parcel, for the payment of 1*d.* up to £5, and for 2*d.* up to £10 a parcel. It is not proposed to pay an *ad valorem* Stamp Duty to the Treasury; but all fees collected for insurance will be paid in as revenue to the Exchequer, and come under Treasury control in the usual way.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH (FINES AND PENALTIES OFFICE)—MR. O'BRIEN, M.P.

Mr. M'COAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is the duty of the Dublin Metropolitan Police to make returns to the registrar of the Irish Court of Queen's Bench respecting all warrants lodged in their hands by the Court; whether it is also the duty of the registrar to make half-yearly returns to the Fines and Penalties Office of all fines imposed by the Court; whether the Fines and Penalties Office is subject to the Chief Secretary; and, whether any such return has been made, either by the police or the registrar, in respect of a warrant of the Court dated July 1st 1884, ordering the levy of a fine of £500 on the goods of Mr. O'Brien, M.P., or, failing such goods, his arrest and imprisonment for twelve months; and, if not, whether he will inquire into the reason of the default, and take the necessary steps to insure obedience to the law in the matter of the said warrant?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): I believe the practice is substantially as described in the Question. I have already stated that I know nothing of the history of this particular case, and I am advised that I am under no obligation, after a lapse of 14 months, to take action in regard to it. How far the enforcement of such a penalty would ordinarily devolve on the Executive is a point on which I have not particularly informed myself; but if the hon. Member wishes for information I would suggest that he should address himself to some Member of the late Government, who were in Office at the time, and who, no doubt, were advised as to the legality of their position.

Mr. M'COAN: Arising out of the answer to this Question, and two previous replies on the same subject, I desire to ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker, upon a point of Order, if it be not even of Privilege. I desire to know whether it is not the right of Members of this House to put Questions to Ministers; and whether, in replying to such Questions, it is consistent with his responsibility, or respectful to the House, for the Minister so interrogated either to refuse to answer, unless he be precluded from doing so in the public interest, or to give vague and evasive replies, containing none of the information asked for, although it is within his knowledge or readily in his power to obtain?

Mr. SPEAKER: No question of Order can arise in connection with the point put by the hon. Member. Of course, the hon. Member is entitled to put a Question to a Minister of the Crown; but it is entirely within the discretion of the Minister to give it any answer which he thinks right. It is for him to judge what answer should be given to any Question.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY—NAMES OF THE COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he can now state the names of the Commissioners in the Royal Commission on Trade Depression; and, whether the Memorandum, to which he referred on Thursday, will be communicated to the House before the end of the Session?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he was afraid, for reasons he gave the other day, that he was not in a position to communicate to the House the names of the Royal Commissioners. The Memorandum to which he previously referred would have to be laid before the Royal Commission before it could be communicated to the House.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD: Does the right hon. Gentleman not remember that he promised the Memorandum should be laid before Parliament? Does he mean the next Parliament?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I said it should be laid before Parliament. It is impossible that a Memorandum addressed to the Royal Commissioners should be made public before the Royal Commissioners themselves have received it.

Mr. SEXTON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether he has reconsidered his decision with reference to the appointment of a Royal Commission for inquiring into the causes of the decline of the industries of Ireland?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I must abide by the answer which I have already given in regard to this matter. It is a matter which is entirely separate from the subject of the Royal Commission that is to be appointed to inquire into the depression of trade.

Mr. BROADHURST asked, whether any steps had been taken to secure a proper representation on the Commission of the main industries of the country both as to employers and employed?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Yes, Sir, such steps have been taken and are being taken.

EDUCATION (IRELAND)—IRISH NATIONAL TEACHERS—ASSISTANT TEACHERS.

Mr. KENNY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, in the event of his Government being in office next Session, he will consider the necessity of removing, with as little delay as possible, the anomaly in the system of payment of Irish National Teachers, by which assistant teachers are deprived of a considerable part of the salaries to which their classes entitle them, and of maintaining a system under which no assistant in an ordinary National School can receive more than a third-class salary though he may have actually attained to the grade of first-class?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that no doubt this Question referred to a matter of importance. It was, however, a matter of detail in the arrangements of the Board of National Education in Ireland, with which it was not his province to interfere. If, however, any proposal on the subject was brought under his notice by the Board, he should be glad to consider it.

ARREARS OF RENT (IRELAND) ACT, 1882—CASE OF MR. TEMPLEMAN, AGENT TO MR. S. C. ARMSTRONG.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Postmaster General, If it is true that, in November 1882, Mr. C. C. Templeman, agent to Mr. S. C. Armstrong, of 39, Brighton Square, Rathgar, Dublin, did make a joint application and a joint affidavit with John Cullen for the discharge of certain arrears of rent under the Arrears Act, due by Cullen out of a farm held by him in the townland of Toughery, county Leitrim; is it true that the Commissioners sent to Cullen a statement that an order had been made for the discharge of said arrears; is it true that when Mr. Templeman found he was not getting the full amount of arrears, he wrote to the Arrears Court stating that no arrears were due by Cullen, and that he joined in the application and affidavit by mistake; what was the purport of that letter, and did the Court defer making the order; if the landlord took instant action against Cullen for the recovery of the rent, and did the landlord swear he joined in the application by mistake, and on same occasion, when receipts were produced differing from the rent book, swore the difference was caused by a mistake of his in filing the receipts; is it true that, after he obtained a decree, he threatened to put it into the sheriff's hands for execution till Cullen was induced to sign a bill on the Ulster Bank for the full amount; is it true that when the Arrears Court investigated the case, they found the arrears were due, and made an order for the payment of a certain sum in lieu of said arrears; is it true that money is still lying in the Court in the landlord's name, and that he or his agent will not draw it; and, if the above is true, will the Government allow the money to Cullen, and what action will the Government take with Templeman?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord JOHN MANNERS): I know nothing of this Question, and must refer the hon. Member to my hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he thought he could answer the Question. A joint affidavit was made, and at first an order was made to discharge the arrears. Afterwards it was discovered that the joint application had been made under a misunderstanding, and this order was rescinded. He knew nothing of the other matters referred to in the Question. It seemed to him that there was no reason for taking any action against Mr. Templeman.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—WATERFORD FREE FORCE.

MR. P. J. POWER asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What is the number of police county Waterford is entitled to as a Free Force; how many of that Force are at present stationed in the county; what is the number of extra police at present quartered in the county; what is the cost of the same for the current half-year; on what grounds is it thought necessary to employ these extra police; have the local magistrates been consulted; and, is it a fact that the number of cases returned for trial to quarter sessions and assizes for the last half-year has been small?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE), in reply, said, the Free Force of Waterford was 219, of which number 213 were at present stationed in the county. The number of extra men was 64, and the cost for the last half-year for which the account was made up—namely, to 31st March last—was £1,097. The number of cases returned for trial at the last Sessions and Assizes was small; but it was still considered necessary to give protection to several persons in the county. The subject was brought before the Grand Jury at the last Assizes, and they were satisfied that the extra Force was still required. He should add that the extra Force in that county had been reduced by 40 men since December, 1883.

MR. P. J. POWER asked whether the Grand Jury paid anything of the money required; and, also, why the Government could not rely upon the ordinary number of constables, as was done in England?

[No reply.]

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) —REVISION SESSIONS—KILMACTHOMAS UNION.

MR. P. J. POWER asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, owing to the difficulty people from the Kilmacthomas Union find in attending revision sessions held in Waterford or Dungarvan, it is intended to hold revision sessions at Kilmacthomas, in compliance with the wishes of the people of that union?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): Yes, Sir; Kilmacthomas has been established as a place for holding a Revision Court.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) SUPPLEMENTAL LISTS, ARMAGH CO.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that one of the persons entrusted with the printing of the Supplemental Lists for the county of Armagh is Secretary of the Grand Orange Lodge of the county of Armagh; is the paper, of which he is one of the proprietors, and in which the lists for North Armagh and Richhill polling district in Mid-Armagh were printed, the local Orange organ; is the manager of that paper an Orangeman and Conservative Registration Agent, who acted in that capacity at the last Revision Court held in Armagh; is it true that the Supplemental Lists for the polling place of Loughgall were at least four days before 20th July exhibited publicly on the counter of the shop in which they were printed; did a notice appear in the same paper last Saturday that claims would be filled at that office for Loyalists and Conservatives; were the Supplemental Lists for the Charlemont and other polling districts in Mid-Armagh exhibited by Conservative agents and others in these districts at least two days prior to the 20th of July; is it a fact that there are no ordinary printers to the Grand Jury, and that the work is done by contract, the lowest tender being accepted; was a notice issued by the Secretary to the Grand Jury inviting tenders for so much of the Supplemental Lists as the Grand Jury had control of; were tenders received or a contract entered into publicly; was it illegal for the Secretary to the Grand Jury and the Clerk of the Crown and Peace to enter into a private arrangement for disposing of the work; if so, will a prosecution be instituted; and, will there be any further inquiry into the irregularities above referred to before the printing of the Claimants' Lists is entrusted to the same printers?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): I cannot undertake to inquire whether persons are Orangemen or not; but if the hon. Member will name the person he refers to in the first part of his Question I may be able to answer as to known matters of fact. Some of the lists for North Armagh were printed in the office of *The Ulster Gazette*, which is a Conservative paper. The Clerk of the Crown and Peace informs me that the lists for Loughgall and other districts were issued on the 17th ultimo, and were largely circulated; but he has no means of knowing where they were exhibited after they left his office. The printing for the Grand Jury is done by contract after application approved at Presentment Sessions. I have already explained that no such application could be made beforehand in this case, but that the account for the printing must come before a future Sessions, when the Justices and cesspayers will have full power to allow, disallow, or modify the accounts. The Clerk of the Crown and Peace was bound to have the work executed.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he did not inform him that they were not Orangemen? He would now ask him whether one of these printers was not Grand Secretary to the Orange Lodge of the county?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: I am not supposed to make that inquiry.

MR. O'BRIEN: I will ask the right hon. Gentleman on what authority he undertook to say that the printers were not Orangemen?

[No reply.]

COMMISSIONERS OF CUSTOMS—A REPORT.

MR. R. H. PAGET asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether, having regard to the importance of the Twenty-eighth Report of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, and especially to the valuable historical retrospect and tables of accounts therein contained, he will be good enough to obtain, from the Commissioners of Customs, a generally similar restrospective history and set of tables, in order that full details of both these great branches of revenue may, as nearly as possible, be simultaneously laid before the public?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Sir Henry Holland): I have been in communication with the Commissioners of Customs with regard to my hon. Friend's suggestion, and I hope it may be found possible to prepare some kind of Report on the lines of the recent Inland Revenue Report. But it will, of course, take some considerable time to prepare.

SLIGO HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS—CHARGES FOR MOORING—LOAN FOR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. SEXTON asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether, having regard to the increase of the dues on merchandise agreed to and put in force by the Sligo Harbour Commissioners, in compliance with the desire of the Treasury, and the new bye-law adopted by the Board enabling them to increase the charge on vessels using the new moorings from 1½*d.* to 3*d.* per ton, by which changes it is estimated the revenue of the port will be increased by £600 per annum, the Treasury will grant, on the security thus improved, the further loan applied for by the Commissioners in their memorial of the 25th ult., and so enable them to continue without intermission, and complete, in the course of a year, the improvement of the harbour, which will otherwise have to be suspended for a time, and then proceeded with only as accumulation of revenue may allow?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Sir Henry Holland): Sir, the application for a further loan in this case came as a surprise upon the Government, having only been introduced by the Harbour Commissioners at the last stage of the correspondence. The Harbour Commissioners have not furnished the Board of Works with the usual statement as to the security they have to offer; but an opportunity will be afforded them to rectify this omission. On their present information, the Treasury are advised that the security is not sufficient to warrant a further loan to the desired amount. The repayment of the instalments upon the principal they have postponed for five years, and that concession should give the Board an immediate surplus of funds.

RELIEF OF DISTRESS (IRELAND) ACT, 1880—LOANS—CO. DONEGAL.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, at the Extraordinary Presentment Sessions held in Letterkenny, under "The Relief of Distress Act, 1880," the inspecting officer of the Board of Works cautioned the court as to the extent to which they might approve of public relief works for the parish of Raymunterdoney, inasmuch as a loan of £800 had been approved of to Mr. Wybrant Olpherts for the purpose of giving employment to the distressed people under the one per cent land improvement loan, and whether the sessions did not therefore limit the public works approved of in that locality; whether it is a fact that such a loan of £800 was only issued to the extent of £320, so that the contemplated employment was not given, although it was on the faith of the inspecting officer's statement that it was to be given that the public works were curtailed; whether it is a fact that even the £320 issued was not expended in giving the promised employment, and that no such drainage works, subsoiling, stone wall building, or fencing was carried out in the manner approved of, but that only a small portion of the sum issued was so expended, and very little of the employment promised to the poor given; whether it is true that the Land Improvement Inspector for the district, Mr. Edmund Murphy, was or is now the agent to the adjoining Ards estate, upon which the other loan specified in Parliamentary Return 263 was approved, and whether his son, an inexperienced young man with no special qualifications as a surveyor, was or is sub-agent upon the said Ards estate, and was also, or is, a Land Improvement inspector under the Board of Works; whether they are both magistrates of the same Petty Sessions district as Mr. Olpherts; whether either or both, father or son, have certified the approval or expenditure of all or any of the loans specified in said Return; and, if so, for what expenditure; whether Mr. Wybrant Olpherts had paid up to the date Return 263 was called for the amount then due upon the said one per cent loan; whether he will have an independent survey made, and an inquiry upon oath instituted as to the expenditure under these loans; and, can he state what became of the difference between the sums issued and the sums expended?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) (who replied) said: I will do my best to answer the numerous points raised in this Question, so far as they are known to the Department which I represent. I have no information as to the action of the Extraordinary Presentment Sessions, or as to the statements made to them. Only £320 was issued to Mr. Olpherts out of the sanctioned loan of £800, the reason being that the time allowed under the Act for execution of the works expired before a further instalment was applied for. Out of this smaller amount £285 was formally certified to have been expended, and the Board of Works are satisfied that the whole of the balance and more was expended on drainage and other works employing labour. But, as doubts have been thrown upon the correctness of this view, an officer of the Board will visit the place at an early date, and will form an independent judgment upon the facts. Mr. E. Murphy and Mr. J. F. Murphy were temporary Inspectors under the Relief of Distress Acts, but I believe are no longer in the service of the Board of Works. The former certified to the expenditure under the loans to Lord Leitrim and Mr. Olpherts; but I have no information as to other occupations of either gentleman. Mr. Olpherts has paid the rent-charge on account of his loan to the last gale day.

MR. O'BRIEN: Will the calculated date of the visit of the Board of Works representative be made known, so that the ratepayers may be able to be represented on the occasion of the inquiry.

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY: Yes, Sir; Notice shall be given.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—SUNDAY MAIL TO ACHILL ISLAND.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Postmaster General, What reply has been given to the Memorial praying for a Sunday mail to Achill Island; and, whether, as the convenience asked for would serve a district extending over thirty miles, and convenience a population of 20,000 people, the facilities demanded can be granted?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord JOHN MANNERS): The Memorial for a Sunday post to Achill Island was refused on the ground that the week-day service was only maintained at a cost considerably greater than the correspondence, according to the usual rule, would warrant, and that there was no surplus revenue available to cover the cost of a Sunday service. I regret that, the circumstances remaining unaltered, I am not prepared to depart from the conclusion arrived at.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—SORTERS IN IRISH MAIL TRAINS.

MR. HARRINGTON asked the Postmaster General, Whether the sorters employed in the Irish Mail trains are in receipt of eight pence per hour promised by the late Postmaster General; whether it is a fact that he promised that this allowance would be made without any deductions for Sundays; and, whether this promise is being observed at the present time?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord JOHN MANNERS): The hon. Member's Question, if I understand it aright, refers to Sunday duty in the travelling post offices in Ireland. The travelling sorters in Ireland, excepting those between Dublin and Cork, are paid, under certain limits, for all work done on Sunday at the rate of 8*d.* for every hour in excess of eight hours in a month of four Sundays. The sorters between Dublin and Cork are excluded from this arrangement, because their rates of remuneration are already exceptionally high.

MR. O'BRIEN asked, whether the promise made by the late Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had been carried out?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL said, he knew nothing of that.

MR. O'BRIEN said, he would remind the noble Lord that this was a portion of the Question on the Paper.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL: I will inquire into that particular point.

ARMY—ROYAL MILITARY ACADEMY, WOOLWICH—MEAL HOURS OF CADETS.

SIR HENRY TYLER asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he will kindly inquire whether any steps have been taken to alter the times for meals of the gentlemen cadets of the Royal Military Academy at Woolwich, especially in regard to the interval of six hours and twenty minutes between breakfast and luncheon, from 7.55 a.m. to 2.15 p.m. ?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): In reply to this Question I will make a quotation from the Report of the Board of Visitors, which I have this day presented to the House—

"The Board were much gratified to notice that they (the cadets) did not display to any extent the pale and jaded appearance they showed last year. On the contrary, they looked smart, and presented generally a bright and healthy look. The improvement may, to some extent, have been caused by the entire change which has taken place in their dietary. A complete alteration has been made in this respect; and in place of breakfast at 7 A.M., early lunch at 11.30, and dinner at 2.15, a cold meat luncheon at 1.15, and a very good late dinner at 7.15, are provided for the cadets, the breakfast hour being now at 7.30 A.M."

EGYPT (THE SOUDAN)—THE SUAKIN-BERBER RAILWAY.

SIR HENRY TYLER asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether Her Majesty's Government have yet considered the question of completing the Suakin-Berber Railway, and the communication by steamers between Berber and Khartoum, with a view to opening out the commerce of and conferring the blessings of civilization upon Central Africa; and, whether they will be prepared at proper times and seasons to proceed with and carry out that policy?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): There is no immediate intention of proceeding with the railway towards Berber; indeed, I may remind the hon. Member that a considerable part of both plant and material have been brought back to this country at great expense. The remainder of the Question has reference to a subject of far greater magnitude than could be dealt with in any ordinary answer to a Question.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I wish to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman will advise the Auditor General to charge the Members of the late Administration with the expenses of this foolish fiasco?

[No reply.]

EGYPT—THE MILITARY EXPEDITION —THE TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

MR. JAMES STUART asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been called to the following extract from a Letter, dated 8th July, received from a young officer stationed at Suakin, and published in the newspapers:—

"Behold the average temperature of the last fortnight in a mess hut, with double roof and sides: maximum, 110·39° Fahr.; minimum, 91·46° Fahr. We have a death every day nearly from sunstroke, heat, apoplexy, or typhoid. I am very well but for a feeling of general limpness, which we all experience. Heaven prevent us from an autumn campaign. The last straw—one ice ship disabled, the other ordered off—no more ice from to-morrow. Sick percentage—European, 20 per cent.; Indian, 16 per cent. The place is not fit for a dog to live in;"

whether there is any truth in the principal statements contained in this extract; and, whether the Government are now prepared to consider the advisability of withdrawing from Suakin without further delay the remainder of the British troops still stationed there?

MR. R. PRESTON BRUCE (for Mr. FRANCIS BUXTON) also asked, What number of British Troops, Egyptian Troops, or Indian Troops, still remain at Suakin; whether it is intended by the Government that they shall remain there permanently, or when they will be withdrawn; what is the state of health of the garrison now at Suakin; and, what policy Her Majesty's Government intends to pursue with regard to that place?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): The recorded temperature at Graham's Point, Suakin, from the 4th to the 10th of July inclusive, averaged 97·8 degrees at 9 A.M. and 102·4 degrees at 3 P.M. As regards sickness among European troops, the percentage for the week ending July 3 was 12·4, and for the following week 16·7, which included invalids sent home. During the same weeks the deaths were 12—namely, six from enteric fever and six from sunstroke. There were no Returns received here as to the Indian troops. I have received a telegram showing how matters stood on the 23rd of July. The British strength was 930, of whom 133 were sick, showing 14·3 per cent; health indifferent; prevailing diseases, fever and nervous exhaustion from heat; enteric fever much less; weather cooler during last few days, health consequently improved, but varies with temperature. Native troops—Strength, 2,405; sick, 161, giving 6·7 per cent; health fair. Steps are now being taken for the immediate relief of the European troops, and no more will be retained at Suakin than are indispensable for the defence of the place.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN asked as to the steps being taken to relieve the Bengal troops, who were suffering great hardships?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE, in reply, said, steps were being taken to relieve the Indian troops in the month of October. The Sikh Regiment would certainly be relieved then; but he could not then say whether the 1st Battalion of the Shropshire Regiment would leave Suakin altogether, or whether part of it would be sent to Cyprus, and then go back to Suakin.

TREATY OF BERLIN, ARTICLE LXI.—REFORMS IN ARMENIA.

MR. M'COAN asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's present Government has taken, or intend to take, any steps to induce the Porte to carry out the reforms in Armenia which were made obligatory upon it by Article 61 of the Treaty of Berlin; and, whether, since the conclusion of that Treaty, the Powers have, as stipulated, received any communication from the Porte respecting the application of those reforms; and, if not, whether any instruction on the subject will be given to the Right honourable Member for Portsmouth on the occasion of his intended mission to Constantinople and Cairo?

MR. BRYCE asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government have taken, or propose shortly to take, any steps to recall the attention of the Ottoman Porte to the engagements it contracted by the sixty-first article of the Treaty of Berlin, to introduce various reforms into the condition of Armenia, and to press upon it the importance of fulfilling those engagements; and, when further Papers relating to Armenia and Asiatic Turkey, in continuation of Turkey, No. 6, 1881, will be presented to the House?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. BOURKE): In reply to the Question of the hon. Member for Wicklow (Mr. M'Coan), I have to say that Her Majesty's Government have not had time to examine the position of this question sufficiently to enable them to take any action in the matter at present. Correspondence has taken place between the British Government and Her Majesty's Ambassador at Constantinople as regards the latter part of the Question of the hon. Member. The matter is one which will not be lost sight of by Her Majesty's Government; but it is not in the interests of the Public Service to state now whether the right hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff) will receive instructions upon the subject or not. In answer to the Question of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce), I have to say that Her Majesty's Government have had no favourable opportunity since their accession to Office of bringing the question before the Porte; and it must be borne in mind that there are other Articles in the Treaty of Berlin, besides the 61st, securing benefits to Turkey which have remained in abeyance. With respect to further Papers, Her Majesty's Government have not had an opportunity of examining the Correspondence with sufficient care to enable them to state whether or not they will be presented at present.

WAYS AND MEANS—INLAND REVENUE—GROCERS' LICENCES (IRELAND).

COLONEL NOLAN asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, If his attention has been drawn to the fact that in Ireland a large number of those who deal in spirits and beer deal also in groceries and soft goods, and that often but a fraction of the space of the shop is used for the sale of liquor; if, in such cases, the licensed victuallers, instead of being rated for Licence Duty in proportion only to that part of the premises devoted to the sale of liquor, Duty is often assessed as if the whole shop were devoted to the sale of liquor; and, if he would give directions that the licences should, in mixed shops, be proportioned to the value of that part only which is used for the sale of liquor?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he believed that, as a fact, it was not uncommon for grocers' shops in Ireland to be used in the manner described in the Question of the hon. and gallant Gentleman; but he thought it was very doubtful whether it was desirable to do anything that would tend to increase that practice. He might state it was the rule, not only in Ireland, but throughout the United Kingdom, that the Licence Duty was fixed with reference to the annual value of the whole of the premises, and there would be a practical difficulty in adopting the change suggested in the Question.

POST OFFICE—MAILS TO THE WESTERN ISLANDS.

LORD COLIN CAMPBELL asked the Postmaster General, Whether any, and, if any, what arrangement has been made to accelerate the Mails to the Western Islands?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord JOHN MANNERS), in reply, said, that the subject was now under the consideration of the Treasury.

GENERAL GORDON—DESIGN FOR A STATUE.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether there is to be a public competition for the design of the contemplated statue to the late General Gordon, or a restricted competition amongst a carefully selected list of sculptors; or, on the other hand, whether the work is to be given by the Government to some one sculptor on its own responsibility?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. PLUNKET): The question of the best way of obtaining designs is still under consideration, and if the hon. Member will favour me with his views on the subject, I shall be very glad to confer with him. Whatever plan is ultimately adopted must, of course, be so entirely on the responsibility of the Government.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY asked whether the right hon. Gentleman would undertake that no definitive steps should be taken for the erection of the statue until the next Parliament had met?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER: I certainly will not give any such pledge.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) ACT—CO. ANTRIM.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Irish Government are aware that in North Antrim, and in other parts of Ireland, claimants and other persons interested in the registering of Parliamentary voters find it impossible to obtain from clerks of the peace and clerks of unions the information and facilities directed by the Irish Registration Act of the present Session to be afforded; and, whether, considering the urgent pressure of time, the Irish Government will immediately direct the attention of the officials concerned to the duties cast upon them by the Statute with regard to supplying forms, and to the inspection and sale of lists, and will warn them of the penalties of fine and dismissal attending violation or neglect of duty? The hon. Member said, further, that he wished to put a further Question on the subject, which was one which concerned not only Antrim, but all other parts of Ireland. The Notices which should have been supplied on the 22nd of last month had not yet been produced; and he wished to ask, firstly, whether penalties of fine and dismissal would not be imposed upon the defaulting officials; and, secondly, whether the claims of the voters would not thereby be invalidated? He would ask also, whether, under the circumstances which he had mentioned, the period for inspection would not be extended beyond the statutory period?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): In answer to the hon. Member, so far as I know, no complaints on this subject have reached the Government, and I believe the officials are fully aware of the duties incumbent upon them under the Statute. The latter part of the Question of the hon. Member clearly has reference to matters of fact, and no such facts have yet been brought before me.

MR. SEXTON: As this is a matter of extreme importance, I must put a Question to the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland. Has he any communication to make as to why the lists were not published on the 22nd of last month; and, will the Irish Government take any steps to hold the officials responsible for that fault? I will also ask whether the specified time for establishing a claim will not be extended until the 4th of August—to-morrow?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES), in reply, said, that he would be prepared to reply to-morrow.

EGYPT (THE SOUDAN)—BATTLE OF ABU KLEA.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether any Despatch was received from Sir Herbert Stewart, after the Battle of Abu Klea, giving an account of the behaviour of the Troops under his command; and, if such Despatch was sent and received, whether he will lay it upon the Table of the House?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): The hon. and gallant Baronet will find the despatch in the Egyptian Papers, No. 9, at page 4.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—MR. F. FALKINER, Q.C., RECORDER OF DUBLIN.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the attention of the Irish Government, or of the Irish Judiciary, has been drawn to the fact that Mr. Frederick Falkiner, Q.C., Recorder of Dublin, in sentencing a grocers' assistant, said—

> "He believed there was an idea existing among grocers' assistants that they could keep to themselves their employers' money;"

and, whether the Irish Government, or the Lord Chancellor, will make any representation to the Recorder of Dublin on the impropriety of such remark?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): I do not know whether this quotation is correct or not. The Recorder is a Judge of independent position, and the Executive Government and the Lord Chancellor have no power or right to question or impugn the language in which a Judge conveys his decisions.

ARMY—LINE BATTALIONS ON FOREIGN SERVICE—THE ROYAL IRISH AND THE EAST SURREY.

MR. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he has observed the very long periods for which certain line battalions have been kept on foreign service, especially the 1st battalion Royal Irish and the 2nd battalion East Surrey, each of which regiments has now two battalions abroad; and, if he will direct that arrangements be made for their early relief?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): The two battalions referred to will be among the first to come home whenever the garrison of Egypt can be reduced.

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—RELEASE OF BRIGGS, A CONVICT.

MR. HOPWOOD asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is true that Briggs was tried at Leicester Assizes last November, convicted of starving his wife to death, and sentenced to twenty years' penal servitude; whether the medical evidence given at the trial was found on further inquiry to be erroneous and misleading; and, whether Her Majesty was advised to pardon the unfortunate man, as innocent?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS), in reply, said, that he believed Briggs had not been pardoned, but was released on licence.

EGYPT (INTERNAL ADMINISTRATION)—USE OF THE KOURBASH AND FORCED LABOUR.

MR. VILLIERS STUART asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he is aware that, in the more remote provinces of Egypt, the arbitrary and capricious use of the kourbash still continues; that no progress has yet been made in reforming the system of forced labour; that the peasantry are still compelled under the lash to excavate canals with their fingers; that neither tools nor food nor shelter are provided for them; that no steps have been taken to deal with the evils of village usury, or to emancipate the peasantry from its baneful consequences; that these and other reforms necessary for the development and prosperity of the Country have remained in abeyance owing to the bankrupt condition of the Egyptian Treasury; and, whether, now that the financial difficulties have been surmounted, Her Majesty's Government are prepared to press forward all urgently needed reforms, and to win thereby the good-will of the Egyptian people?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. BOURKE), after thanking the hon.

Member for sending him communications containing information on the subject, and also reminding him of some answers which were given by the late Government with regard to this subject, said, he could find no record at all in the Foreign Office which corroborated in any way the statements in the Question of the hon. Member.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON LOSS OF LIFE AT SEA—THE EVIDENCE.

MR. ATKINSON asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, If he will lay upon the Table Copy of any Communications which may have been received at the Board of Trade, from Shipping or other Associations, protesting against the proposed issue of evidence given on behalf of the Board of Trade before the Royal Commission on Loss of Life at Sea, until the evidence on the other side of the question be also fully taken?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS): In answer to the Question of the hon. Member, I have to say that communications have been received from the General Shipowners' Society and the Hull Incorporated Chamber of Commerce and Shipping, protesting—

> "Against the publication of the *ad interim* Report of Evidence taken before the Royal Commission on Shipping, on the ground of its *ex parte* character, the Board of Trade case having been presented and but a small portion of the Shipowners' reply having been as yet heard."

The Central Executive of Shipowners of the United Kingdom have forwarded to the Board of Trade copies of two letters which they have addressed to the Chairman of the Royal Commission on the subject. Without expressing an opinion as to the expediency of such partial publication, I would point out to the hon. Member that the matter rests entirely with the Commission, and that the Board of Trade have no power whatever to prevent or postpone the publication of the Report, or of any portion of it. I have no objection to lay on the Table copies of the two letters referred to in the first part of my answer.

EDUCATION (IRELAND)—THE MODEL SCHOOL, KILKENNY.

MR. MARUM asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Infant Department of the Model School of the district of Kilkenny has not been amalgamated with the Female Department; whether the Model School Farm of the same district has not been surrendered, and agricultural training and teaching has not ceased; and, why the Model School appears upon the face of the Estimates for Public Education this year in its normal aspect?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): In answer to the hon. Member, I have to say that the Kilkenny Model School only appears on the face of the Estimate for the amount required for the boys' school, and the amalgamated girls' and infants' school; no charge, therefore, appears in the Estimate for the model school farm which has ceased to exist.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND)—LISTS OF VOTERS—DERRY.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is the case that a high hoarding has been erected around the dispensary house in William Street, Derry, in such a manner as to obstruct the public view of the lists there exhibited of persons returned as entitled to be registered under the Representation of the People Act; and, whether measures will be taken to have the obstruction removed or the lists better displayed?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): I have made inquiries and cannot find that there is any foundation for this statement. On the contrary, I am assured that there is not, and has not been, any such obstruction as that indicated.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—COLLEGE OF ABERYSTWITH.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD asked the Vice President of the Council, Whether it is true, as stated in a local paper, that the Government have made up their minds to give an additional grant to the College of Aberystwith; and, whether they have made provision for giving the increased grant in the present year?

THE VICE PRESIDENT (Mr. E. STANHOPE), in reply, said, that the subject referred to in the Question was under the consideration of the Government, and he was not yet in a position to announce the decision at which they had arrived.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT: I desire to ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he can inform the House what Business will be taken to-morrow?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I think the principal Business to-morrow, if we finish the Committee on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill this evening, as I hope we may, and take a stage of the Secretary for Scotland Bill, would be the Irish Land Purchase Bill, and the Federal Council of Australasia Bill.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON asked when the Criminal Law Amendment Bill would be taken on Report?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I should hope on Wednesday.

Mr. NEWDEGATE asked whether the Government intended to take any other Business on Wednesday?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Wednesday is now a Government day.

IRISH LAND COMMISSION—THE NEW COMMISSIONERS.

Colonel KING-HARMAN asked, If the Government intended to give the names of the two new Commissioners to be appointed?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he could not give any undertaking on the subject yet.

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—THE JEFFREYS' CASE—MR. EDLIN (ASSISTANT JUDGE).

Mr. CALLAN said, that, seeing the right hon. Gentleman the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt) in his place, he wished to put a Question to him with reference to his statement on Friday night, that he knew nothing of the prosecution of the Jeffreys' case, that it was not conducted by the police, but by the local authorities. He (Mr. Callan) wished to ask, Whether it was not the fact that the local authorities—namely, the Chelsea Vestry—took no part in that prosecution any more than the Home Office? He also asked, Whether a representative from the Home Office did not attend on the third occasion at the Police Court; whether he did not make a report to his superiors; and, if so, what was its nature; why did the late Home Secretary not direct the Public Prosecutor to intervene in that scandalous and abominable case; whether the right hon. Gentleman still adhered to his statement that Inspector Minahan was dismissed for insubordination; and whether he had seen the letter in *The Pall Mall Gazette*, in which Inspector Minahan stated that he was dismissed for describing Mrs. Jeffreys's house as a "brothel for the nobility?"

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT, in reply, said, it was impossible to carry all these Questions in one's head; but he should answer, as far as he could. He answered the points very fully the other night when they were raised in the debate. He did not state that the prosecution in the Jeffreys' case had been conducted by the Local Authorities. On the contrary, he specifically stated that it was conducted by a Society with which Mr. B. Scott, the City Chamberlain, was connected, being one of its leading members, and that they were responsible for the conduct of the prosecution, which the hon. Member described as disgracefully conducted.

Mr. CALLAN, interposing, denied that he had so described the prosecution. He had asked why the Public Prosecutor had not intervened in such a scandalous and abominable case? He cast no reflection on the prosecution.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he saw no reason to interfere. The prosecution was conducted by persons who had a right to do so, and he saw no reason to interfere. An attack had been made on the police in this matter by Mr. Minahan, who stated generally that they were in connivance with the owners of these houses. He should read to the House a paragraph from the Report of the Chelsea Vestry at exactly the same period of 1883-4. It was headed, "The disorderly houses at Chelsea," and was as follows:—

> "The committee are unable to estimate too highly the services which the police have continued to render them in their investigations. The ready attention, the discriminate action, the painstaking observation, and the thorough reports with which the committee have been favoured by the Commissioners and the local officers have enabled them to continue the administration of a wholesome, and, indeed, valuable check to a nefarious trade, which, but a few years since, endangered the moral tone and reputation of the parish."

He thought the House would receive that as against the statement of Mr. Minahan. It was not accurate to say that Mr. Minahan was dismissed. He was reproved for insubordination, and his rank was reduced and upon that he resigned. The insubordination did not consist in the charge with reference to the Jeffreys' case; it was only one of 15 instances in which he charged his superior officers with misconduct. All these charges were examined into and were found to be baseless. His resignation was one and a-half years before the Jeffreys' case arose; and it was entirely untrue that that case was the main or prominent part in Minahan's charges. He brought many charges against the police, and the only part which the Home Office had in the matter was to inquire into the foundation for the charges brought aginst persons of all ranks in the police by Minahan. It was his duty to see that they were inquired into, and he did so; and it was because the Home Office had reason to believe that these charges would be made against the police on the evidence, that it was represented at the hearing. The charges against the police made by Minahan had been carefully investigated. Objection had been taken to the fact that the Commissioners of Police undertook that investigation; but if they were not the proper persons, who were? If he (Sir William Harcourt) had considered that the Commissioners were unfit to conduct such an inquiry, it would have been his duty to remove them. The conclusions to which they arrived were that the charges made by Minahan against his superiors were unfounded. In that conclusion he agreed, and it had, therefore, been his duty to support in this House the Commissioners of Police in action which was necessary for the discipline of the Force.

Mr. CALLAN gave Notice on the Appropriation Bill to call attention to the conduct of the late Home Secretary with reference to the Jeffreys' case and other cases.

POST OFFICE—SIXPENNY TELEGRAMS.

In reply to Mr. Alderman LAWRENCE,

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord JOHN MANNERS) said, it was hoped that the Act reducing the price of telegrams would come into operation on the 1st of October.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES BILL.

Mr. COURTNEY asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, in view of the strong opposition on the Royal Commission itself to the proposal as to the prison sites, the Government will persevere with the clauses on that subject?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that was a Question for his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary, who had charge of the Bill. He would, however, remind the hon. Gentleman that the Bill was the Bill of the Royal Commission rather than of the Government.

Mr. COURTNEY said, he would then ask the Secretary of State for the Home Department, with regard to the clauses of the Bill relating to the sale of prison sites, Whether he is aware that that particular recommendation of the Royal Commission was dissented from by a strong section, headed by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Ripon (Mr. Goschen); and, whether, in that case, the Government will continue to persevere with those clauses, which will inevitably lead to prolonged discussion?

Mr. BROADHURST said, he wished to draw the attention of the right hon. Gentleman to the fact that the Bill was now blocked by a very active Member of the Royal Commission.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): When the hon. Member who has just spoken rose I thought he was about to ask a Question with reference to Clause 13 of the Bill, in which I know he takes a great interest. I have to say that that clause will be considerably modified. As to the Question of the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), it seems to me that the clauses relating to the prison sites, although they appear hard to some people, are really one of the greatest benefits that could be conferred upon the people of London, and I, individually, should be very sorry to see them struck out.

EGYPT—THE INTERNATIONAL GUARANTEED LOAN — THE CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD asked, with reference to the statement that the negotiations with regard to the Egyptian

Loan were suspended when the change of Government took place, When the Correspondence would be distributed?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BOURKE), in reply, said, the intervention of Saturday — a short day with printers — Sunday, and the Bank Holiday, might cause delay; but he hoped the Papers would be in the hands of Members by Wednesday morning.

MR. VILLIERS STUART asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he was to understand from a previous answer that Her Majesty's present Government did not see their way to press forward the reforms in Egypt, which they were led to expect would follow when the finances of Egypt were restored to a proper condition?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. BOURKE) said, he did not say anything about that. He was asked about the kourbash, and other Questions of that kind, and he did not mean to lead the House to understand that the reforms which the late Government thought necessary would not be pressed on the Egyptian Government by Her Majesty's present Government.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

MR. JAMES STUART said, it was not quite clear from a previous answer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that he had definitely fixed Wednesday for the Report of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that he could not make a definite promise. He could only say he hoped it might be taken on Wednesday.

MR. LABOUCHERE asked whether the third reading of the Appropriation Bill would be put down for Thursday?

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR asked whether, seeing the important Business before the House, the final stage of the Bill could not be postponed for a few days?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I hope it will not be necessary to do that. I remember the promise I gave the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere), and I shall be careful not to take the third reading until the Egyptian Papers are circulated. If circulated to-morrow, as I hope, we may ask the House to take it to-morrow.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, they had been circulated that morning.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he had not been aware of that fact. He could not say whether the Bill would be taken to-morrow or Wednesday; but, at any rate, it would be taken at a convenient hour.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — POLICE ENFRANCHISEMENT BILL.

MR. COLERIDGE KENNARD asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he would give facilities for proceeding with this Bill?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am afraid I cannot see my way to give a favourable answer at present; but I am aware that the Bill is favourably regarded by hon. Members in all quarters of the House.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—LABOURERS (IRELAND) BILL.

MR. GRAY: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, in view of the lateness of the Session and the importance of the subject, he will take the Labourers (Ireland) Bill to-night, even at this late hour?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I think the time will be fully occupied by the Criminal Law Amendment Bill. I would like to be able to take the Labourers (Ireland) Bill, as I think it an important matter.

MR. SEXTON: I wish to ask the Government when they intend to proceed with the Labourers (Ireland) Bill. It has been on the Paper of the House since the beginning of the Session. Also with regard to the Lords' Amendments to the Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Bill—the Amendment containing the proxy vote, and allowing the *ex officio* members to retain half the seats at the Boards—I wish to ask the hon. and learned Attorney General for Ireland, what action does the Government intend to take? If those Amendments are agreed to, the Bill may as well be dropped.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) asked for Notice of the Question.

Mr. SEXTON: In the meantime, can the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer say anything about the Labourers Bill?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I am afraid I cannot say more than I have already said.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: In consequence of the great anxiety that exists in all parts of Ireland and amongst the Irish Members with regard to the Bill, I would like to put one Question more to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, first premising, if I may be allowed to do so, that there was no action of the new Government which gave so much satisfaction in Ireland as their announcement of their intention to take up the Bill. The Question I wish to ask is, Whether, as Irish Members of all Parties for the most part remain here till the hour at which the House rises, there would be any practical inconvenience in taking the Bill at any hour, as there will always be Representatives here of all sections of the Irish people?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I cannot answer that Question without previous communication with my right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland on the subject. I may, however, say that I have no intention of dropping the Bill.

Mr. SEXTON: I beg to give Notice that I shall resist further progress with the Appropriation Bill until the Labourers (Ireland) Bill has passed through the House.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND BILL.

Sir LYON PLAYFAIR said, that in view of the assurance formerly given, that they would receive proper time for the discussion of the Secretary for Scotland Bill, he would ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer after what hour he would not take that Bill that night?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I am afraid that is a Question I can hardly answer.

EAST INDIA (REVENUE ACCOUNTS).

Ordered, That the several Accounts and Papers which have been presented to the House in this Session of Parliament, relating to the Revenues of India, be referred to the consideration of a Committee of the whole House."

Resolved, That this House will, upon Thursday, resolve itself into the said Committee.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

——o——

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

[*Lords.*]—[Bill 159.]

(*Secretary Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 31st July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

New Clause:—

(Power of Search.)

"If it appears to any justice of the peace, on information made before him on oath by any parent, relative, or guardian of any woman or girl, that there is reasonable cause to suspect that such woman or girl is unlawfully detained for immoral purposes by any person in any place within the jurisdiction of such justice, such justice may issue a warrant authorising any person named therein to search for, and, when found, to take to and detain in a place of safety such woman or girl until she can be brought before a justice of the peace; and the justice of the peace, before whom such woman or girl is brought, may cause her to be delivered up to her parents or guardians, or otherwise dealt with as circumstances may require.

"The justice of the peace issuing such warrant may, by the same or any other warrant, cause any person accused of so unlawfully detaining such woman or girl to be apprehended and brought before a justice, and proceedings to be taken for punishing such person according to law.

"A woman or girl shall be deemed to be unlawfully detained for immoral purposes if she is so detained for the purpose of being unlawfully and carnally known by any man, whether any particular man or generally, and—

(a.) Either is under the age of sixteen years; or

(b.) If of or over the age of sixteen, and under the age of eighteen years, is so detained against her will, or against the will of her father or mother or of any other person having the lawful care or charge of her; or

(c.) If or above the age of eighteen years she is so detained against her will:

Any person authorised by warrant under this section to search for any woman or girl so detained as aforesaid may enter (if need be by force) any house, building, or other place specified in such warrant, and may remove such woman or girl therefrom,"—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross,*)

—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R.

ASSHETON CROSS) said, that after the clause was read a second time, of course, Amendments might be moved upon it. This was the clause which was under discussion the other day when it was objected to take it at so late an hour of the night.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, he was quite prepared to support the clause as far as it went.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be added to the Bill."

MR. JAMES STUART moved, as an Amendment, to insert, after the word "girl," the following words:—

"Or any other person who, in the opinion of the justice, is *bonâ fide* acting in the interest of any woman or girl."

The hon. Member said, he had given Notice of that Amendment the day after the clause of the Home Secretary was put upon the Paper, and it had remained upon the Notice Paper immediately after the clause of the right hon. Gentleman until to-day. He saw that it had now disappeared from the Notice Paper, and he presumed that that was in consequence of the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman having been introduced as a new clause. He had anticipated, however, that his Amendment would have been printed on the Notice Paper among the other Amendments, and he did not know why that had not been the case. At any rate, he proposed now to move the Amendment of which he had given Notice. The effect of the Amendment would be to increase the power under the section, or, rather, to increase the number of persons who could make use of it. At present, a search warrant could be obtained upon application by a parent or guardian, provided that the clause became law; but it could not be obtained by any other person. He was glad that the Home Secretary had introduced the clause in this form, because he thought that it was a considerable improvement upon the clause as it stood originally in the Bill; and he would make an urgent appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to insert in the clause the words which he proposed, and which appeared to have dropped out of the clause, seeing that they existed in it when the Bill was introduced by the late Government. He proposed their re-insertion on this ground—that the clause, in many important cases, would be practically inoperative unless some such words were introduced. He regarded this clause as one of the most important in the whole Bill, and it was, therefore, necessary to trace its history. As the Bill was introduced into the House of Lords, a Search Clause was inserted; but that Search Clause, in his opinion, was absolutely bad. It gave power of search to the police, and to the police only, and it only gave them an indefinite power of search. The clause, as it now stood, was a much better clause. A search warrant was given on the application of an interested party, and it was given for a specific object, and, therefore, it did not possess the objections which the original clause did. Why was it that he wanted to add these words? For this purpose, principally—that the poor children whom they had to get out of these houses, where they might be confined for immoral purposes, had, in many cases, neither parent nor guardian. They were poor children who, as a rule, never possessed a guardian; and, whether they had parents or guardians or not, they had generally been removed from the locality where the parents or guardians lived to a distant locality. He would ask the Committee to imagine the case of a child whose parent or guardian was either out of London—it might be in Bradford, or Dublin, or Edinburgh—or in some distant part of London. That child was known to be in an immoral house, detained for immoral purposes. The parent or guardian, being far away, might have telegraphed to a clergyman or some other person who knew the child in order that he might take proper steps for rescuing it; but in that case the law would be perfectly inoperative, because the whole essence of the matter was time. It must be remembered that it would be fatal if they were required to wait for any length of time. Then, again, take another instance. Those who were well qualified to speak upon the subject knew that the parents not unfrequently sold their children, and, therefore, they would not be anxious to take them out of the miserable position in which they were placed. He thought that, in such circumstances, when a child was deserted by its father and mother, the State should be at liberty to step in, and that the whole nation should be regarded as the guardian of the poor child, in order to prevent her from undergoing the horrible fate which awaited her. He was glad to see an Amendment upon the Paper in the name of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Hereford (M. R. T. Reid), by which his hon. and learned Friend proposed to provide that a girl under 21 might be made a ward in Chancery, even although no property belonged to her or had been settled upon her. It would be highly advantageous if such a clause could be utilized for the purpose of getting a child out of the custody of those who detained her for immoral purposes. It was stated that the Amendment which he proposed would open the door for the action of Societies. He was prepared to welcome the action of Societies in the matter, and he wished to open the door to them. His objection to the Bill was the difficulty of putting it in operation; and he believed that the action of societies in respect of the Bill would, in that respect, be most valuable. He had no wish to see the action of societies generally in connection with the Criminal Law; but he submitted to the Committee that, in regard to the particular state of circumstances with which the clause dealt, the action of societies might fairly and properly be allowed, and the aid of societies was one of the advantages which he hoped would accrue from the adoption of the clause. He believed that there were many excellent societies which would carry out such work as this; and if they only succeeded in getting these little children out of these houses, they would strike an important blow against the abomination they were desirous of putting down, and which led to the seduction and ruin and prostitution of little children. It was upon such grounds that he was anxious to see some of the benevolent societies which existed in this country acting in the matter, and it was most important to introduce words into the clause which would enable them to act. He had no doubt that there were benevolent societies and benevolent individuals, who were very well known to the general public, who, if telegraphed to under pressing and terrible circumstances, would at once take upon themselves the duties of parent and guardian; and what he desired was to give them the right of acting in that manner. He, therefore, begged to move the addition of the words he had read, and he appealed to the Government to agree to their insertion, knowing, as he did, that the Home Secretary and the Government were really anxious to make the Bill operative, and believing that they had introduced this clause with that *bonâ fide* object; and having had a long acquaintance with the subject, he was perfectly sure that the clause would be practically inoperative in really serious cases, where little children were confined against their will, unless these words were added. It was to make the clause operative that he begged to move their insertion.

Amendment proposed,

In new Clause, in line 2, after the word "girl," to insert the words "or any other person who, in the opinion of the justice, is *bonâ fide* acting in the interest of any woman or girl."—(*Mr. James Stuart.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he thought there was very great force in the remarks which the hon. Member had just made. It must, unfortunately, be admitted that in many cases the parents of a child were its worst guardians. He should have no objection to the insertion of the words proposed by the hon. Member, if they could be guarded in such a way as not to give a roving commission to anyone who desired a search warrant. He was quite willing to extend the clause to others who were not the parent and guardian; and the wording of the clause ought to give a *bonâ fide* guarantee against any person interfering who had no right to interfere. That object would be accomplished by requiring him to prove to the Justice that he had a *bonâ fide* interest in the girl. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) had included these words in the original Bill, and, as they stood in the Amendment, he thought they would provide that the person applying for the warrant must satisfy the magistrate of his *bonâ fide* interest in the girl whom he alleged to be detained; and with that security he (Sir R. Assheton Cross) was prepared to accept the Amendment.

Mr. HOPWOOD wished to give a word of warning to the Committee in regard to this clause. It was the first departure, as far as he was aware, from the law by which the liberty of a girl up to 16 years of age was placed in the hands of somebody other than her parent or guardian. There was nothing in the Bill which, if this clause and the Amendment were adopted, would prevent persons who were not the parents or guardians from obtaining absolute power over the personal liberty of a child up to the age of 16. He wished to point out to the Committee that this was a very remarkable and exceptional power. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary was of opinion that it would be guarded by the words "having a *bonâ fide* interest in the girl," whatever those words might mean. He (Mr. Hopwood) thought, on the contrary, that it might lead to monstrous mischief. What was to be done after the search warrant had been executed? Was the person who asserted that he had a *bonâ fide* interest to have possession of the child? There were no means of giving that power except to the extent of removing the child to some industrial institution. Did the Home Secretary intend to follow the Amendment up by a further Amendment which would meet that difficulty? He knew very well what the answer would be—that it was a matter with which the Government could not deal; and the consequence would be that, in the case of children over 12 years of age, there was a possibility of their returning to the same places unless there happened to be someone who could exercise the power and control of a parent over them. In the case of industrial schools, there was power even to take a child away from its mother, and it was repeatedly done upon no other plea than that the mother was a prostitute. Upon that ground the child was taken away from her and sent to a school, where she could never see it. The mother and child were separated by force, no doubt with the best intentions on the part of benevolent people; but there were no persons who could be as cruel as benevolent people. Very often the existence of a child was the only tie between Heaven and earth which these unfortunate women possessed. In many instances there was a beloved and tender child, treated with the utmost care, kept in total ignorance of the mother's life, and yet down came some benevolent lady, who had never felt the springs of maternity within her, who took possession of the child, and, obtaining an order from the magistrates, ruthlessly carried her away without the slightest regard for the maternal feelings of the mother. He asked the Committee to judge what sufferings might be produced in a heedless manner by acts that were set on foot at the dictates of benevolent persons, and by these fussy voluntary Organizations which imagined they could govern the world better than Providence did. He admitted that much might be done by voluntary effort, but not in the shape of legislation.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER hoped that the Committee would consent to this Amendment, and pointed out that the Factory Acts recognized that a girl below 18 years of age could not protect herself. How could his hon. and learned Friend, or anybody else, suppose that these poor creatures under 16 could have the slightest power of protecting themselves? It was not a question of putting stringent clauses in an Act of Parliament, but a question of protecting those who might be exposed to the greatest misery and the greatest outrage which could possibly be brought upon them. They knew very well what the facts were. Children were inveigled into these houses, it might be even with their own consent; but he maintained that they were unable to give consent, and he was sorry to say that in many cases children were entirely neglected by their parents, or the parents themselves became accessories to their being placed in this wretched condition. The question, however, was whether the State was to assist in exposing young children to this criminality. If ever there was a case for the interference of the Legislature it was a case of this kind, and unless they gave full powers of search by means of which they might rescue the poor creatures who were detained in these immoral houses they would do very little good. Surely it was a very fair thing that there should be a somewhat quick and speedy means of getting a child out of such danger.

Mr. STAVELEY HILL said, he took no exception to anything that had fallen from the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. Forster) in regard to the clause; but his objection to it had reference to the mode in which it was drawn, and the enormous width of the cases it embraced. He would give an illustration of a case which would come within this section. If a wife were to fly away from her husband, and take refuge from him in a friend's house, and the place where she was staying came to the knowledge of the husband, he would have nothing to do but to go before a magistrate and swear that she was kept there against her consent, and the very object of the woman's flying away, in order to seek refuge in a place of safety until she could receive the full protection of the law, would be frustrated. It might be said that he knew that the husband would have to swear an affidavit, and that if he made any false statement he would be guilty of perjury. But how was he to be indicted, and how could perjury be assigned against him? This clause was one of the serious consequences of hasty legislation. The Committee were now about to adopt a clause which he ventured to say would do quite as much harm as good.

Mr. MUNDELLA said, he hoped the Committee would consent to the clause as it had been proposed by the Home Secretary, and also that they would accept the Amendment. He would take a case in point. The Home Secretary had very justly stated that in some instances the parent might be the worst guardian a child could have, and that he was often a consenting party to the offence. He would take the case of domestic service where a mistress inveigled young maid servants into her house, and appeared to take great interest in them, when her only object was to make use of them for immoral purposes. Surely in such a case any person who was acquainted with a girl under such circumstances should be able to take steps for going before a magistrate to express his or her belief that the girl was detained for immoral purposes? He hoped that the suggestion of his hon. and learned Friend opposite (Mr. Staveley Hill) that a husband might make some affidavit affecting a wife who had taken refuge in a friend's house, which had really no bearing on the matter at all, would not prevent the Committee from taking the necessary steps for protecting these children. He believed that this was the only way of making the clause effectual, and that unless they gave power to some other person besides the guardian or parent to step in, the clause, in numerous instances, would remain practically inoperative.

Mr. WARTON said, that whatever his opinion might be with regard to the clause he was not going to stake it against that of the main body of the Committee; but he appealed to the Home Secretary and the Attorney General whether the words proposed by the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Stuart) would carry out the object aimed at? The words were—

> "Or any other person who, in the opinion of the justice, is *bonâ fide* acting in the interest of any woman or girl."

In his opinion, the words ought to be "such woman or girl."

Mr. JAMES STUART said, he rose to a point of Order. He wished to point out that the words he proposed to insert were accurately drafted, and the words "such woman or girl" occurred afterwards.

Mr. WARTON said, the hon. Member was quite mistaken; the clause would read in this way—

> "If it appears to any justice of the peace, on information made before him on oath by any parent, relative, or guardian of any woman or girl, or any other person who, in the opinion of the justice, is *bonâ fide* acting in the interest of any woman or girl, that there is reasonable cause to suspect that such woman or girl is unlawfully detained for immoral purposes," &c.

He maintained that the first words "any woman or girl" should be "such woman or girl."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, it might be some comfort to his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) to tell him that they were now only discussing the spirit of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Stuart). After they had agreed upon the insertion of these words, it would be quite open to amend the clause by substituting the word "such" for "any."

Mr. MUNDELLA said, he thought the difficulty might be met by omitting the words—

> "On oath by any parent, relative, or guardian of any woman or girl."

The clause would then read—

> "If it appears to any justice of the peace, on information made before him, that there is reasonable cause to suspect that any woman or girl is unlawfully detained for immoral purposes," &c.

Mr. WARTON said, he did not think the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman would meet the difficulty he had pointed out.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, he could not accept the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman, because his contention was that the governing words of the clause should be that the application was made by the parent or guardian or by some persons acting *bonâ fide* in the interest of the girl.

Mr. RAIKES said, the clause, in line 2, referred to "any woman or girl," and if they added the words—

> "Referring to any person who, in the opinion of the magistrate, was interested in such woman or girl,"

it would be left just as wide as it was now by the words which appeared in the clause. The words to which it was proposed to attach the Amendment of the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. Stuart) were general, and would cover the case of "any woman or girl;" and if they added the words "referring to any such woman or girl," the word "such" would be of no use as qualifying the clause in this particular. He wished to point out that circumstance to the hon. and learned Attorney General. He did not know whether it occurred to the hon. and learned Gentleman; but it appeared to him that the word "such" would not carry out the intention with which it was suggested, and that the word "such" would, in this respect, have no value or meaning whatever.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he thought the best way of meeting the objection would be to put in words to say "any woman or girl in respect of whom the information was granted." He trusted that as the Committee seemed inclined to accept the Amendment, it would be accepted without further debate, and the verbiage of the clause could be easily altered when they came to discuss the clause as a whole.

Mr. M'COAN wished to call attention to a defect in the clause. Even if it was amended as proposed, it would give to the parent or guardian or anyone possessing a *bonâ fide* interest in the girl the right of laying an information before a magistrate to search for any woman or girl who was suspected to be detained for unlawful purposes, and when found there would be authority to detain her in a place of safety until she could be brought before a Justice of the Peace, who might order her to be delivered to her parents or guardians, or otherwise dealt with "as the circumstances might require;" but once out of the hands of the law there was no provision made as to the subsequent condition of the girl. He thought that was a defect which ought to be remedied, for it appeared to him that the moment the girl or woman was outside the door of the place where she had been unlawfully detained, her rescuer would have no power over her whatever.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, the clause gave power to the Justice of the Peace to deal with the case in such manner "as the circumstances might require," and to deliver her up to her parents or guardians.

Mr. M'COAN said, there might be cases in which the girl had neither parents nor guardians, and there ought to be some provision to say what was to be done under such circumstances, because, so far as the law was concerned, the person who had succeeded in getting her out of the place where she was unlawfully detained for immoral purposes would have no power whatever over the girl afterwards.

Mr. GREGORY said, it appeared to him that the words were entirely governed by subsequent words—namely, that it should be—

> "A woman or girl whom there was reasonable cause to suspect to be unlawfully detained for immoral purposes."

He was glad that the Government had accepted the Amendment. He was connected with an institution—the Foundling Hospital—which had given him some little experience in cases of this kind. He had found that in numerous instances a girl whose parents were dead, and who had no guardians, was placed out in domestic service, and it very often turned out that the person into whose service she went, or a District Visitor, or some person of that description, was the only person who took any interest in her, or showed her any kindness. It would be very proper to clothe these persons with some legal authority, if they were willing to accept the responsibility of it.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. WARTON moved, in line 4 of the proposed new clause after the words "immoral purposes," to insert the words "as in this section defined." The clause would then read—

> "If it appears to any justice of the peace, on information made before him on oath by any parent, relative, or guardian of any woman or girl, that there is reasonable cause to suspect that such woman or girl is unlawfully detained for immoral purposes, as in this section defined."

The clause as it stood used the term "immoral purposes," but at the same time did not define what those immoral purposes were, and it might be contended that an artist who made use of a model for the purpose of a sketch might be brought under the operation of the clause. He thought they ought to have "immoral purposes" clearly defined, because there might be other purposes which would be held to be immoral than those which were defined in this Act. There would be no use in passing a clause applying to immoral purposes without they defined what those immoral purposes were, and took precautions to see that the provisions of the the Bill were enforced.

Amendment proposed,

> In proposed new Clause, line 4, after the words "immoral purposes," to add the words "as in this section defined."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he had no objection to the insertion of the words.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. JAMES STUART said, he now proposed an Amendment, in line 5, of which he had given Notice some days ago. It was to omit the word "may," in order to insert the words "shall forthwith." The clause as it now stood provided that—

> "On information being given in any place within the jurisdiction of a justice of the peace, such justice may issue a warrant authorising the person named therein to search for, and, when found, to take to and detain in a place of safety such woman or girl until she can be brought before a justice of the peace."

The effect of his proposal would be, instead of making it permissive for the issue of the warrant, to compel the Justice to issue it "forthwith." He conceived that the word "may" had been transferred into the clause, as it was now drafted, from the original clause, and upon that original clause he had given Notice of an Amendment when it first appeared. He thought it was undesirable to leave the matter within the discretion of any Justice of the Peace whether he should issue a warrant or not, after a sworn information was laid before him by any person properly authorized to make it under the Act. What he desired was that the Justice of the Peace should be obliged to issue the warrant just as he would be if the case were one of theft. In point of fact, the only effect of this Amendment would be to make a warrant in cases of this kind run on all fours with a search warrant for stolen property. He thought the necessity of a warrant being issued forthwith was quite manifest, because it was of absolute importance to obtain the power of search as speedily as possible, so as to guard against any wrong happening; and as he believed the whole of the provisions of this Bill would be brought under the Vexatious Indictments Act, there would be a remedy against any person who wrongfully applied for a warrant in the matter. He, therefore, begged to move the insertion of the words "shall forthwith," instead of the word "may."

Amendment proposed,

> In new Clause, line 5, after the words "such justice," to omit the word "may," and insert the words "shall forthwith."—(*Mr. James Stuart.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'may' stand part of the new Clause."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he could not possibly accept the Amendment. The whole matter was left, in the clause, to the discretion of the magistrate, and it would be useless to make the proposed change, because there would be nobody who could be a judge in the matter except the Justice of the Peace before whom the information was laid.

MR. STANSFELD said, he was inclined to think that the Amendment would give greater effect to the clause. The clause at present read—

> "That if it appeared to any justice of the peace, on information made before him on oath, that there was reasonable cause to suspect that a woman or child was unlawfully detained for immoral purposes by any person in any place within the jurisdiction of such justice, he might issue a warrant authorising the person named in it to search for and detain in a place of safety any such woman or girl until she could be brought before a justice of the peace."

That, however, was simply permissive, and the object of the Amendment was to compel the Justice of the Peace to issue the warrant.

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. WHITBREAD moved an Amendment, the object of which was to give the officer execting the warrant power to bring before the magistrate other persons found in the house whom he suspected to come within the operation of the Act. He wished to know what it was that his hon. Friend contemplated? The house which was to be so searched might probably be found to be one in which there were one or more girls detained who were not specified in the warrant. What, in such a case, was to happen if an officer went there with a search warrant, and, although he succeeded in finding the girl for whom he was in search, found other girls detained by the owner of the house with every reason to believe that they were unlawfully detained for immoral purposes? When the Bill came down from the House of Lords the only person who could execute the search warrant was a Superintendent or Inspector of Police, or some officer of that kind, and such Superintendent or Inspector of Police, or officer, would have power to apprehend and bring before the Justices any person who might be found on such premises, in regard to whom there might be reasonable ground for believing that she was detained for immoral purposes. This clause, as it had now been amended by the Home Secretary, seemed to have weakened the Bill as it originally came down to the House from the House of Lords, and he would, therefore, move to amend the clause, in line 14, by inserting the words—

> "That any person holding such warrant, if a superintendent or inspector, or other officer of police, shall apprehend and bring before a justice of the peace or stipendiary magistrate any person whom he may have reasonable grounds to suspect to be guilty of an offence under this Act, and also any woman or girl in respect of whom such an offence is charged."

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. INCE said, he had an Amendment which would come before the one proposed by the hon. Gentleman. In line 4 occurred the words "in any place within the jurisdiction of such justice." The effect of those words was to provide that the Justice of the Peace, who was to issue the search warrant, must be a Justice having jurisdiction in the place where the girl or woman was detained. He had been looking at the Larceny Act and some other Acts, including, among others, an old Act of George III., having regard to searches for marine stores belonging to the Crown, and in all those Acts the right of granting a warrant to search appeared to be general — that was to say, that any Justice of the Peace might issue a search warrant, and it was not at all material that the Justice of the Peace by whom the warrant was issued should have jurisdiction in the place to which the warrant applied. This was a somewhat important matter, because it might sometimes be difficult to define the exact limits of jurisdiction.

Mr. GREGORY rose to a point of Order. The hon. and learned Gentleman was raising a question upon line 4 of the new clause, whereas the Committee had already passed an Amendment in line 5.

The CHAIRMAN said, that was so, and the Amendment of the hon. and learned Gentleman would, therefore, be out of Order.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, he could not approve of the Amendment which had been moved by the hon. Member for Bedford (Mr. Whitbread). He had considered this point before, and whatever might be the actual scope of the words originally used in Clause 6 of the Bill, he did not think they were intended to have the operation which was evidently the desire of the hon. Member. There could be very little doubt that if the words proposed were inserted, anybody found on the premises in respect of which a charge was made would be liable to be brought before a Justice of the Peace. He did not think it was ever intended to give a roving commission to the police of that kind which would enable them to bring before the magistrates almost any person whatever who was suspected of being guilty of an offence. Certainly, if that had been the intention of the present clause he should have asked the Committee not to adopt it. The clause as it now stood directly specified what the cases were in which the police should have the right of search, and who the persons were who were to be brought before the Justices; but the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member would give a general power which would be liable to be abused. If a police constable happened to see some girl in one of these houses, which he was entitled to search by virtue of a warrant, there would be very little difficulty in finding out whether it was a case which ought to be dealt with, and making it subject to another information; but he (the Attorney General) submitted that it would not be wise to give a power of this kind to the police, and he thought that the clause of his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary went far enough.

MR. WHITBREAD said, that if that was the opinion of the Law Officers of the Crown he would not press the Amendment; but he would point out to the Committee that in such a case as that which had been mentioned by the hon. and learned Attorney General the girl might be spirited away before a fresh warrant could be executed.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. SERJEANT SIMON moved an Amendment, in line 27, giving the officer in possession of the search warrant power to enter, besides the original place—

"Any other house, building, or place where there is reasonable ground to suspect that such girls may be found."

His object was to deal with a case of this kind. A parent or guardian, or other person having a *boná fide* interest in the girl, might lay information and apply for a warrant; but, on endeavouring to execute it, it might be discovered that the girl had been spirited away to another house or place, and the effect of adopting this Amendment would be to enable the police constable, or any other person executing the warrant, to follow the girl. He thought some such words were necessary to give effect to the clause. The object of the Amendment was so obvious that he did not think it necessary to discuss it at length.

Amendment proposed,

In new Clause, line 27, after the word "warrant," to insert the words "or any other house, building, or place, where there is reasonable ground to suspect that such girls may be found."—(*Mr. Serjeant Simon.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he could not accept the Amendment; and he would remind the Committee very briefly what the foundation for this new power was. It was an information before a magistrate stating that the parent, or guardian, or other person having a *boná fide* interest in the girl, had reason to suspect that she was unlawfully detained for an immoral purpose in a certain house or place specified. The word "place," of course, was an elastic one, which might apply to a house or street, or to more than one house; and if the magistrate had information before him he would issue a warrant in such a form as to justify the police officer in entering more than one house. It was, however, desirable to fix the special place to which the search warrant should apply; and if the police officer had reason to believe that the girl had been taken away to another place it would then become necessary to apply for a fresh warrant. He submitted to the Committee that it was not desirable, in giving a power of this kind to the police, to give what he had previously called a roving commission. He thought that the person who applied for the warrant ought to satisfy himself, in the first instance, as to the place which ought to be searched. He sympathized very much with the argument of his hon. and learned Friend; but he thought that by adopting the Amendment they would be going a step too far.

MR. HOPWOOD quite agreed with the hon. and learned Attorney General. He thought it would be monstrous to confer upon the police these large powers, under which, for instance, they might be able to search Buckingham Palace or any other place. It would be most objectionable, in a Bill of this nature, to give powers of search beyond those already conferred in other cases by the Common Law either to a parent, or guardian, or to any other person who might have a *boná fide* interest in a girl in regard to whom there was reason to believe that she was unlawfully detained for immoral purposes. If a constable had reason to believe that a felony had been committed, he would have the right to enter under a warrant so far as any question of felony or misdemeanour was concerned. Those powers existed at present, and, in reference to the particular cases dealt with by the Bill, it would be a felony if the girl were under 13, and a misdemeanour if she was under 16. His own opinion was that the law conferred ample powers already, and to give the police further powers, under this clause, would be to bring about the mischief which his hon. and learned Friend had shadowed forth.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON said, he regretted that his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General could not accept the Amendment, because he thought that it simply carried out the object of the clause itself. So far as entering a house in order to see whether a felony had been committed, what he wanted was that the police should have authority to enter it in order to prevent a felony from being committed. If it were found that the person for whom the police were searching had been removed, the Committee would see what loss of time might be involved. In the first place, it might not be possible to find a magistrate at once, and there would be considerable difficulty in getting a fresh warrant. Take this case. In the afternoon a police constable went in search of a child, and found, before he could execute the warrant, that she had been removed; he, however, received information which would justify him in obtaining another warrant; but on going back for it he found that the magistrate had gone away, that it was impossible to obtain another warrant, and, in the meantime, all the mischief was done. What he wanted was to prevent the felony from being committed; but if the Committee would not support him in the Amendment he would ask leave to withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. Serjeant SIMON said, he believed they had now reached the end of the new clause, and in that case he had an Amendment to propose, the object of which was to add to the clause words providing that—

> "In the absence of a Justice of the Peace, or, if it were found impossible to go before a Justice of the Peace, a Superintendent or Inspector of Police, or other officer in charge of a police station, shall, on receiving information on oath, as in the clause mentioned, take such information down in writing, and shall act upon it in all respects as if a warrant had been issued as aforesaid; and that any person who shall wilfully make such information, knowing it to be false, shall be guilty of perjury, and may be proceeded against and punished accordingly."

He was quite aware that the words he proposed to add might be open to objection. He was quite alive to the danger of placing a power of this kind in the hands of a police officer, or of any other person, even if it were the Home Secretary or the hon. and learned Attorney General himself. No one was more keenly alive to the importance of safeguarding the liberties of the people, and of not allowing them to be subjected to the irresponsible and despotic action of the police; but in all cases there were instances to be found which would demand exceptional treatment. Under the clause, as it now stood, a search warrant might be obtained by information on oath before a magistrate by any parent, relative, or guardian, or other person, having a *boná fide* interest in any woman or girl, that there was reasonable cause to suspect that she was unlawfully detained for immoral purposes; but what was to happen if a magistrate could not be found? Suppose that it became necessary to apply for a warrant late at night, and that information reached the police station through the parent or guardian that a child was locked up in a particular house for immoral purposes, and it was desirable to obtain power at once in order to rescue and save the child. Unless the magistrate could be found, which might be very difficult at a late hour of the night, no warrant could be obtained, and the child might fall a victim unless some provision, such as that which he suggested in the Amendment, were inserted in the clause. He was certainly of opinion that power ought to be given to the police to go and do all that was necessary, even without a magistrate's warrant, just as the police would have the right to do on receiving information that a felony had been committed. As his hon. and learned Friend the Member for

Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) had pointed out, if a felony had been committed, and the police received information of it, they already possessed the power of entering a house, and taking into custody the criminal who had committed the offence. It was, therefore, no novel power to give to the police to enable them to enter a house without a warrant. The case he wanted to provide for was a case where a felony had not actually been committed, and where a child had not been made the victim of a great crime. What he wished was to save the child, if possible, from the consequences of the position in which she was placed; and it was, therefore, for that reason that he proposed to insert these words to provide that if by any accident it was found impossible to go before a Justice of the Peace, then the Superintendent or Inspector of Police, or any other officer in charge of a police station, should be able to receive information on oath, and take down such information in writing, and should act upon it in all respects as if a warrant had been issued. In order to guard against abuse, he proposed to add that if any person should wilfully and falsely make such information, knowing the same to be false, he should be guilty of perjury, and should be liable to be proceeded against and punished accordingly. His object in adding that proposal was to safeguard the Amendment. Short of having a warrant issued in the presence of a magistrate, supposing that a magistrate could not be found it was desirable that the police should take information on oath, the same as would be necessary for the issuing of a warrant; but he had safeguarded that power by providing the punishment of perjury against any person who wilfully made a false statement. It was only in a very extreme case that the power would ever be used. The felony might not have been actually completed; and all he proposed was to extend to the police constable, in a case where it was suspected that a felony was about to be committed, the power which he now possessed where a felony had actually been committed.

Amendment proposed,

At end of new Clause, to add—" In the absence of a Justice of the Peace, or, if it were found impossible to go before a Justice of the Peace, a Superintendent or Inspector of Police, or other officer in charge of a police station, shall, on receiving information on oath, as in the clause mentioned, take such information down in writing, and shall act upon it in all respects as if a warrant had been issued as aforesaid; and that any person who shall wilfully make such information, knowing it to be false, shall be guilty of perjury, and may be proceeded against and punished accordingly." — (*Mr. Serjeant Simon.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, that much as he respected the motives which had induced his hon. and learned Friend to make this proposal he was sorry that he was obliged to oppose the Amendment. This, as he had pointed out before, was a very important duty. His hon. and learned Friend proposed to give the power even to a police officer for the time being in charge of a police station. They had heard of cases where grave mistakes had been committed by police officers in charge of a police station when persons were brought to the station; and he did not think that the Committee would be willing to entrust to a subordinate police officer a duty of such responsibility.

Amendment *negatived.*

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) moved to add at the end of the clause the following Proviso:—

"Provided always, That every warrant issued under this section shall have been addressed to and executed by a Superintendent, Inspector, or other police officer."

As the clause had been framed by his right hon. Friend the Home Secretary, the warrant was to be issued upon information laid by the parent or guardian, or any person having *bonâ fide* interest in the girl. Upon that information it was proposed that a warrant should be issued by a Justice of the Peace authorizing one of these persons to search for and bring up the girl. It was quite clear that this might be a work of considerable difficulty, requiring great tact; and there might be occasions in which a breach of the peace might be caused, and it would be dangerous, after the law were put in motion, if some person, in no way connected with the administration of justice, but only having an interest in the girl, were allowed to go, unassisted by anybody connected with the law, to carry out the warrant. The Proviso would, he thought, in no way weaken the clause, but rather strengthen it in requiring that the warrant should always be carried out by a responsible police officer.

Amendment proposed,

At end of new Clause, to add — "Provided always, That every warrant issued under this section shall have been addressed to and executed by a Superintendent, Inspector, or other officer of police."—(*Mr. Attorney General.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. HOPWOOD objected to the words "other officer of police." They would include all, for every policeman was an "officer." He thought that a Police Inspector ought to be the lowest officer entrusted with this power.

Mr. WEST suggested that the word might be "constable" instead of "police officer." There might be instances in which the only officer available would be a parish constable.

Mr. JAMES STUART said, he understood the object of the Attorney General to be that in either case the execution of the warrant could only be entrusted to a police officer.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, that was so.

Mr. JAMES STUART agreed that it would be quite proper to take precautions to prevent a person visiting a house of this kind with a search warrant in an infuriated state of mind. Under such circumstances, a breach of the peace might be occasioned, and he should, therefore, be accompanied by a police officer; but he thought that provision should be made to enable the parent or guardian to accompany the police in the search if it were only for the identification of the child. To Clause 6 of the Bill as it originally stood he had put down an Amendment to this effect—to enable a police officer of ordinary or superior rank to enter the premises with such assistance as he might consider necessary. In addition to those words he proposed, in order to make it sure that there should be ample identification of the child, to add these words—"Such assistance as may be necessary for the identification of the girl or otherwise." His object in making that proposal was to permit that in every case where the parent or guardian made a proper representation he should be allowed to accompany the police in the search. He was afraid that the parent or guardian would run the risk of being excluded if the words suggested by the Attorney General were adopted; and he hoped, therefore, the hon. and learned Gentleman would reconsider the exact form of words with a view of providing for the point he had indicated.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) thought the words proposed by his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General were all that were necessary. They required that an officer of police, whether an ordinary constable or an officer of superior rank, should execute a warrant; and it was perfectly clear when any necessity arose that the police would have a perfect right to take such strength with them as they might deem necessary for enforcing the warrant, or for the purpose of identification. Therefore, the words which the hon. Gentleman proposed to add would be mere surplusage.

Mr. JAMES STUART said, he certainly felt, seeing that this was a matter of morality, some distrust in regard to the action of the police; and, therefore, he would like to give the parent or guardian something more in the shape of a right than the mere permission of the police to accompany them in the search for the purpose of identification.

Mr. STAVELEY HILL said, he could not understand why, if the hon. Member had a distrust of the police, he should desire to give them such enormous powers. It was quite clear that no police officer in his senses would go to look after a girl if he was not accompanied by somebody who was able to identify her.

Mr. BULWER said, the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Stuart) had remarked that the relative or other person interested in the case might be in an infuriated condition. It was, therefore, extremely desirable that the police officer should have some discretion vested in him to say whether it was wise to associate with himself in the search an infuriated person who might probably bring about a breach of the peace.

Mr. INCE pointed out that there might be danger of collusion to a certain extent if they placed the right of search in the hands of the police only. It must be borne in mind that the persons with whom the police would have to deal in these cases were, in most cases, persons making a large income out of their nefarious practices; and, therefore, they would be supplied with long purses, which might be exercised in preventing a poor man from obtaining his rights. If they put the right of search entirely in the hands of the police, without desiring to make any imputation upon that body, he thought they might be putting an instrument in the hands of men who worked hard for extremely small salaries, and who were, consequently, open to bribes. It must also be borne in mind that the execution of the law would be entrusted to them as against persons who possessed the means of bribing, and who would not hesitate to go any length in order to prevent the possibility of discovery.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) reminded the hon. and learned Member that there was nothing new in the clause, and that all warrants were now executed by the police.

Amendment *agreed to*.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, be added to the Bill."

MR. M'COAN said, that, before the clause was finally adopted, he wished to call attention to the vagueness and inadequacy of the words in the 10th line of the clause, which provided that the girl might be delivered up to her parents or guardians, "or otherwise dealt with as circumstances may require." To his mind, that contained no enactment whatever, nor did it add anything to the present power of the Justices. A girl might be taken out of a house which was not necessarily a brothel, and, once out of it, the power of interference by the police would be exhausted. The girl would be practically in the streets without being under the legal control of any person whatever. He had brought that question forward before, but had been stopped by a remark from the right hon. Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt), that the case was one which was dealt with under the Industrial Schools Act. But on referring to that Act he found that he (Mr. M'Coan) was right, and that the right hon. Gentleman was entirely wrong. The present clause referred not only to girls, but to women. There were two Acts which affected the question, and the first, which was passed in 1866, provided for the detention of girls under 12 years of age; the second increased the age from 12 to 14; and in those cases there was power to send the girls to an industrial school. But there was no provision for girls beyond that age. The Act of 1880 did provide for the treatment of and dealing with girls who were found lodging, living, or residing reputedly for purposes of prostitution; but that was a limitation of possibility which was not dealt with by this new clause at all. He had no doubt that there were cases in which girls were smuggled into a private house or hotel which could not be described as being kept "for purposes of prostitution," and in that case the girl could not be said to be living in the companionship of prostitutes. Unless, therefore, there was some such provision as he suggested, the law would still remain inoperative; and he trusted the Home Secretary would consent to the insertion of some words which would render the clause more effective.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, the hon. Member asked what was to be done with the girl when she was taken out of the house where she had been detained for immoral purposes? The clause provided that she must go with her parent or guardian, or, if no parent or guardian was to be found, with any person who had a *bonâ fide* interest in her before the Justice of the Peace. He presumed that if there was no person to take charge of her she could be handed over to the Board of Guardians and taken care of out of the rates. He thought that course would be taken under the clause as it stood at present; and if there was no parent and no legal guardian the girl would, of course, be sent to the workhouse, and dealt with in some other way. He did not wish to send her before the magistrates, unless there was no other way of dealing with her; and, therefore, he would be chary in putting any additional words into the clause. He would, however, consider the point before the Report, and see whether the clause could be altered in any way.

MR. JAMES STUART said, he was satisfied, as far as he was concerned, with the promise given by the right hon. Gentleman; but he should not be astonished if there were a large awakening of public opinion in this matter, and if it were ultimately found that children who were rescued were subsequently left homeless and friendless. Under the circumstances, he would be prepared to await the result of the operation of the clause before taking further legislative action in so difficult a matter. The only objection he had at present to the clause was to that part of it which related to the execution of the warrant, and which placed the sole power in the hands of the police. The right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill said that the insertion of additional words was not necessary, because all the warrants were now executed by the police; but he thought that some words should be added to give the Justice of the Peace power to order that some person should accompany the police officer in the execution of the warrant. He thought that that might meet the difficulty; and upon the Report he would propose an Amendment to that effect.

Mr. GREGORY said, he thought it would be very dangerous to impose any legal liability in regard to the future care of a girl rescued under these circumstances upon the person who had interposed in her behalf. There were many persons who would be anxious to befriend children placed in this deplorable condition; but if it were to involve a future liability to provide for them they might hesitate very much about showing any kindness in the matter. There were a good many individuals who would do a great deal voluntarily; but if it came to compulsion, they would, at any rate, hesitate before they incurred any responsibility.

Mr. BRYCE said, that before the clause was added to the Bill there was one point upon which he wished to say a word. He desired to call the attention of the Home Secretary to the fact that in many cases it was very difficult to know where the magistrates were to be found, as many of them lived a long distance from their courts. He thought it would very much conduce to the smooth working of the measure if some steps were taken to remedy this difficulty. In London some of the stipendiary magistrates lived a long distance from the police court at which they presided, and were not accessible at night at hours when an application for a warrant would most probably be made. It would be most advantageous, he thought, if steps were taken to make known who the Justices of the Peace were, and where their residences were to be found. He made the suggestion to the Home Secretary in the hope that he would give instructions to the police to provide that this information should be readily obtained at all the police stations.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) thought that the matter alluded to by the hon. Member was one rather of administration than of legislation. At the same time, he thought the suggestion was a very good one, and he would consider it before the Report.

Mr. R. T. REID said, that a case might occur of special emergency, and he asked if the Home Secretary would consider before the Report if it were possible to take any course, properly safeguarded, which would enable a Superintendent of Police, or some other police officer, where it was found impossible to get a police magistrate to interfere, to exercise some limited power.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to*, and *added* to the Bill.

Mr. STANSFELD moved, after Clause 5, to insert the following Clause:—

(Medical examination when unlawful).

"Any medical man, midwife, or other person who, knowing or having reasonable cause to believe that the examination is required with a view to an immoral purpose, shall examine any woman or girl in order to discover whether she be a virgin, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and, being convicted thereof, shall be liable, at the discretion of the court, to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour."

The right hon. Gentleman said that the proposal which he submitted to the consideration of the Committee was an exceptional one; but it was made under exceptional circumstances. They had heard a great deal lately of the abuse of the privileges of the Medical Profession in connection with the commission of abominable offences, and it was against the perpetration of such offences that the clause was directed. He did not know whether there was any person who could say to what extent these offences were committed; but the allegations which had been made had not been contradicted, as far as he was aware, either on the platform or in the Press; and, therefore, he was bound to believe that, to a certain extent, they were true. If there were cases of the kind, whether they were few or many, he held it to be the duty of Parliament to make provision for them. He therefore begged to move the clause which stood in his name.

New Clause *brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he could not ask the Committee to agree with the clause. Of course, he accepted the statement of the right hon. Gentleman who moved it; but he objected to the clause as a matter of principle. In the first place, he thought it would be unwise, on the face of the Bill, to draw a distinction between girls who came within the class of virgin and those who were not. It would be a very difficult thing indeed to decide who should come within that class, and it was not desirable, when they were administering the law on a broad principle, to say that special privileges should be given to any particular class; but there was another objection to the clause, which he would specially commend to the right hon. Gentleman. It was well known by those connected with the administration of justice, especially in the Divorce Court, that it was absolutely necessary, for proper and sufficient purposes, that an examination should sometimes take place by a medical man; and if this clause were passed medical men might decline to have anything to do with such an examination. Even assuming that a girl was not a virgin in the sense which the right hon. Gentleman meant, it might still be right to have a full opportunity for examination; and he did not think it was desirable that the Bill should contain a clause in favour of special protection being given to any class of persons. As to what had been said in reference to the recent action of the Press, he desired to say very emphatically that, however much public opinion, with reference to the subject-matter of the Bill, might have been awakened by the Press, the opinion of the Government had not been so awakened, inasmuch as they would have adhered to the Bill in any circumstances, and it would have been proceeded with quite apart from any statements which had appeared in the Press. At the same time, he had no wish to pass any criticism upon the action of *The Pall Mall Gazette;* and he certainly did not attach so much importance to that part of the exposure which referred to proceedings of the kind mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman as he might to some others.

MR. MITCHELL HENRY said, that as the Government did not intend to accept the clause, his duty would be rendered more easy than it would otherwise have been. He had come down to the Committee to protest against the clause, and to oppose it by every means in his power. He regretted that the right hon. Gentleman should have attempted to place an unmerited stigma upon a distinguished Profession by the manner in which he had worded the clause. He would ask the right hon. Gentleman what ground he had for branding an honourable Profession with the most frightful imputations which could be cast upon any class of persons? He was convinced that in no part of the world, except in England, could any person for one moment have supposed that medical men required to be specially legislated against on account of practices of this kind being prevalent among them. The right hon. Gentleman appeared to be satisfied with a very small amount of evidence in order to induce him to inflict an inexcusable and abominable insult upon a Profession which everyone respected. If the right hon. Gentleman wished to frame his clause simply to insure that the object of it should be carried out, it would have been quite sufficient to have used the words "any person," instead of which he had attempted to inflict upon the Medical Profession an insult of which they were altogether undeserving. He protested against the infamous publication which had charged medical men with the malpractices to which this clause had reference. What possible good, he asked, could be done by the offensive and bestial prints with which the town was now inundated? For his own part, he did not believe one word of the statements which had been made, and he would like to call the attention of the Committee to the conduct of the conductors of the journal in which they had appeared. [*Cries of* "Question!"] What they had done appeared to be to discover some medical man who was willing to make himself a party to these disgraceful proceedings, and then to publish an account of the investigations of this medical man. He believed that in so doing they had themselves been guilty of a criminal offence. If not guilty of a criminal offence it ought to be made one; and, so far as the Medical Profession was concerned, this individual who had placed his services at the disposal of *The Pall Mall Gazette* was the only individual who had really and truly appeared in such a position. He was therefore glad that the Government objected, not only to the first words of this clause, but to the whole of it. Whether it was true that such things were ever done he did not know; but he did not think it was proper to place such a brand upon their common humanity without better proof than that which had been afforded in the columns of *The Pall Mall Gazette.* He trusted that the Committee generally would express its indignation against *The Pall Mall Gazette* for continuing to inundate the country with unnecessary sensual and pestilent paragraphs.

Mr. STANSFELD remarked that after the violent attack which had been made upon him——

Mr. WARTON: No, no!

Mr. STANSFELD said, the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) must forgive him if he repeated that it was a violent attack.

Mr. WARTON: Not half strong enough.

Mr. STANSFELD said, the hon. Member had undoubtedly made a somewhat violent attack upon him. He did not object to that attack, because he knew that the hon. Gentleman had in former times been an honourable and distinguished member of the Profession which he now desired to defend. But what he (Mr. Stansfeld) wished to draw attention to was the fact that the hon. Gentleman had practically justified his clause, because the ample knowledge he possessed of the Profession of which he was formerly a member did not induce him to say that such things had not happened in the past and might not happen again. His hon. Friend stated that if they wished to accomplish this object it ought to be accomplished by a different method, and by the use, in the clause, of different phraseology. He was perfectly ready to accept any different phraseology; but he had felt that he could not logically put it in any other form. It would have been impossible to make his meaning clear except by putting it in these words; but when his hon. Friend came forward and said that he could not accept the Amendment unless it was put in a form which would not convey a reflection upon an honourable Profession he had no answer to give except to express his readiness to acquiesce in the request of his hon. Friend, and to say that he should be delighted to do so if it were possible. Having made that concession he should feel bound to insist upon dividing upon the clause.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, the clause was undoubtedly a very strong one so far as the honourable Profession to which it related was concerned. It might be the fact that some cases of this kind had happened; but he should be sorry to see such a clause put into any Bill at the present moment without there was the strongest evidence to show its necessity. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to have forgotten one point—namely, that if a medical gentleman undertook an examination of this kind at the instance of a third person he would undoubtedly be guilty of conspiracy, and would lay himself open to a prosecution together with the other person concerned. He believed that the law relating to indecent assaults was quite strong enough, and would meet the object of the right hon. Gentleman. He, therefore, hoped that the clause would not be pressed.

Sir LYON PLAYFAIR expressed a hope that his right hon. Friend would not divide upon the clause. There might be in the Medical Profession, unhappily, some person so degraded as to undertake an examination of this kind; but that was no reason why they should insert a clause in the Bill which would cast an imputation upon the whole Medical Profession. His right hon. Friend stated in the clause—

> "Any medical man, or other person, who had reasonable cause to believe that the examination was required for an immoral purpose."

How was a medical man to have reasonable cause to believe that except by instituting a cross-examination of a most delicate nature which might place him in a very difficult position?

Mr. STANSFELD said, he had no objection to leave out the words "medical man."

Sir LYON PLAYFAIR said, the words which followed were "midwife, or any other person."

Mr. STANSFELD said, he would confine the clause to "any person."

Sir LYON PLAYFAIR remarked that, in his opinion, the clause was not required at all. If a degraded medical man, or any other person, could be induced to make such an examination he would place himself under the law relating to indecent assaults; and, therefore, the clause was not required.

Mr. SAMUEL MORLEY desired to say a word or two with regard to what was said by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Galway (Mr. Mitchell Henry) as to certain statements which had appeared in *The Pall Mall Gazette.* No doubt, as a matter of taste, most serious objections might be raised to the *modus operandi* of the newspaper in question; but he was prepared to say distinctly, having been engaged for four days with three or four distinguished men in making an investigation, that the truth of the statements made by *The Pall Mall Gazette* was substantially proved to the satisfaction of the Committee. He would even go so far as to say that the half had not been told of the condition of things in London. Although he could not approve of the phraseology adopted by the writer of the articles, he believed *The Pall Mall Gazette* had done an enormous service to the moral life of London. He trusted his right hon. Friend (Mr. Stansfeld) would carry the Amendment to a division; if he did he (Mr. S. Morley) would certainly vote with him.

Mr. STAVELEY HILL declared, in the face of the country, that if the statements made by *The Pall Mall Gazette* had been proved to the satisfaction of what was called the Committee of Investigation, it was the duty of the Committee to give the names of the persons implicated. A filthy editor of a filthy production had no right to make gross charges against Englishmen occupying exalted positions in Church and State, and then to go skulking before four or five men who were as unfit to try the case as they would be to try a domestic cat. If the allegations were true it was the duty of the publishers of the journal in which they were made to give the names of the guilty persons. Dearly cherished as some members of the Investigation Committee were, it was their duty also to give to the House and the country the names of the persons implicated, so that if they had been guilty of these foul practices they might be convicted of them and dismissed from the offices they held.

The CHAIRMAN: I must beg of the Committee to return to the consideration of the clauses of the Bill.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, everybody must feel that if crimes of this kind were committed by medical men they ought to be punished. But the Committee must be very careful what they did. He pointed out to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld) that it was not merely by generalizing the words that the guilty men only would be reached. The great risk which the Medical Profession ran of having charges preferred against them was very well known, and therefore he entreated the Committee to pause before accepting this Amendment. If a clause of this kind were carried, he could not see how a medical man could safely, in delicate cases, attend women at all. Suppose a woman, suffering from a painful disease with which human nature was afflicted, went to a doctor for advice. What would be the position of the medical man if he felt there was the possibility of a criminal charge being preferred against him? Of course, examinations of a certain nature must necessarily be made very privately; and, therefore, the medical man was at the mercy of any person who consulted him. This was a fact which must be taken into consideration.

Mr. FIRTH thought it was very undesirable to duplicate legislation. If he rightly understood the Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross) it was the right hon. Gentleman's opinion that legislation already provided for a case of this kind. He would like to know from the hon. and learned Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) whether he did not consider that offences of the nature contemplated were not sufficiently met by the existing law?

Mr. DWYER GRAY said, it was a very serious thing to ask the House of Commons to cast a slur of this kind upon a highly honourable Profession upon the strength of the allegations made in *The Pall Mall Gazette*, allegations in which no names had been mentioned. No means of identification had been provided, and the verification of the allegations, if verification it could be called, had been made by a number of gentlemen who, however much they might be respected—and, of course, the Committee did respect them individually and collectively—had, in the opinion of rational men, discredited their own certificate. The Investigation Committee said they did not investigate charges against classes; secondly, they did not investigate charges against the police; thirdly, they did not investigate charges against individuals. What, then, did they investigate? What conceivable means could they have taken to verify the charges? There might be medical men who were a discredit to their calling; but the same thing happened in every Profession. He asserted that the suggestion that the Medical Profession as a body, or any appreciable percentage of them, would prostitute themselves by going about certifying to the physical condition of girls was an outrageous calumny upon the Profession. He protested against any Amendment of this kind. Personally, he was of opinion that what was now contemplated would amount to conspiracy, and was covered by the law as it now stood.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY protested against one remark made by the right hon. Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld). The right hon. Gentleman said he (Mr. Mitchell Henry) admitted the necessity, to some extent, of a clause of this kind.

Mr. STANSFELD said, that what he said was that the hon. Gentleman admitted that such cases might occur.

Mr. MITCHELL HENRY said, the observation the right hon. Gentleman had just made showed how very cautious the Committee ought to be in what they did in this matter. He (Mr. Mitchell Henry) did not make the observation attributed to him. He repudiated, on the part of the Medical Profession, any kind of complicity in this matter, and he said most distinctly that he believed the charges were inventions and lies. And, further than that, he now wished to say that he thought his hon. Friend the Member for Bristol (Mr. S. Morley) would have done himself more honour in that House if he had said one word in condemnation of the paragraphs which had appeared recently—so late as Friday last—in *The Pall Mall Gazette*, calculated to excite the passions of the individuals who read them, and totally unnecessary to accomplish the good object with which *The Pall Mall Gazette* professed to have introduced the subject. He trusted his hon. Friend would do that yet, because his voice was potent, and a word from him might possibly prevent a repetition of these loathsome and wicked paragraphs calculated only to sell the paper.

Mr. R. T. REID said, he was sorry that so much heat and so much irrelevant matter had been imported into this debate. Perhaps the Committee would allow him to make one observation with regard to his responsibility concerning the investigation into the statements made by *The Pall Mall Gazette*. For what small part he had taken in that investigation he intended to be responsible to himself. He was not responsible to the House of Commons, and would not be. He hon. Friend (Mr. S. Morley) and himself had done what they thought their duty in a most painful and difficult inquiry, and he was not going to answer to anybody. Now, he intended to vote for this Amendment; but he had not the smallest desire to make an imputation against the Medical Profession. Were they to be told that they were not to legislate in regard to a particular evil because it was suggested that wrong might be done to a Profession which stood as high, if not higher than any other Profession? His firm conviction was that this offence was rarely, if ever, committed by medical men at all. It was committed, as a rule, by the midwives, or wretched people connected with this unhappy and nefarious traffic. What he would suggest to his right hon. Friend (Mr. Stansfeld) was that he should omit from his Amendment the words "or having any reasonable cause to believe," because before they convicted a man or woman of an offence of this kind they ought to be satisfied that the person knew that the examination was being made for an immoral purpose. If his right hon. Friend would so amend his clause that it would read—

> "Who knowing that the examination is required with a view to an immoral purpose,"

a safeguard might be provided against the evils which had been pointed out by the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt). He could not help thinking that this evil existed, and he would be glad to learn from the Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross) whether he was informed by the police of its existence. He (Mr. Reid) would vote with his right hon. Friend (Mr. Stansfeld); but he trusted that no hon. Member would suppose he did so in the belief that the Medical Profession was not one of the highest, if not the highest, Profession in point of honour in the whole country; he believed there was no Profession which stood more deservedly high than the Medical Profession.

MR. EDWARD CLARKE said, that, knowing the part the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Hereford (Mr. R. T. Reid) had played in the recent inquiry, the Committee must with great satisfaction have heard him say that he believed that rarely, if ever, had this offence been committed by a medical man. But the hon. and learned Gentleman failed to comprehend the objection to this clause. It was not objected to because it might possibly imply a reproach on an honourable Profession; but it was objected to because it would add to the many dangers which beset that Profession. Charges which might be made might be dissipated and disproved; but the very making of them would be sufficient to ruin the most honourable man practising in the Profession. It was because the clause would open the door to an infinity of accusations that he hoped the Committee would reject it.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA believed that the adoption of this clause would add to the dangers to which medical men were subjected in the performance of their duty; and, therefore, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Stansfeld) would not divide the Committee upon the clause.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, that in answer to the appeal of the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Chelsea (Mr. Firth) he had to say that the Government did not oppose this clause on the ground that the offence was covered by the present law, but because the clause was one which ought not to be introduced in the Bill.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 50; Noes 115: Majority 65.—(Div. List, No. 266.)

MR. RAIKES said, the Amendment which appeared in his name was directed to the second part of the Bill, and was intended for the protection of girls and women who were in a good many cases compelled to remain residents in houses of ill-fame when they might be anxious to escape. He believed there was no more potent engine employed by the keepers of these houses than the threatening of unfortunate women with criminal proceedings if they went away with wearing apparel which had been supplied to them. He understood it was a common case that girls, when they went to houses of this description, were induced to part with their old clothing, and were supplied with other and more attractive apparel, so that they might ply their trade successfully. The consequence of this was that the unfortunate women felt bound to remain in a life which they might be heartily sick of. He understood that the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) had an Amendment on the Paper of a kindred nature to which he (Mr. Raikes) had no objection; and if his Amendment were accepted by the Committee he should be happy to agree with him to put them into one clause. He had also reason to believe that there might be some suggestion made on the Treasury Bench of words to cover part of the ground; and he should be very happy to hear what the suggestion would be, with the view, if possible, of accommodating what was contained in this clause to the views of the Government in this matter. In the hope that his proposal might be of some assistance in reclaiming from this life a number of their fellow-country women, who he believed were detained entirely against their will by the power which was exercised over them by the keepers of these houses through the belief that they would be prosecuted if they went away with the clothes lent to them, he asked that the clause should be read a second time.

New Clause—Page 4, after Clause 8, to insert the following clause:—

(No criminal proceeding against a woman for retaining apparel supplied by owner, &c. of brothel.)

"Whereas it frequently happens that women and girls are intimidated and deterred from leaving brothels by threats of criminal proceedings for taking away with them wearing apparel which has been lent or otherwise supplied to them by any person, being the owner or occupier of such premises, or having or acting or assisting in the management or control thereof: Be it therefore declared, That no criminal proceedings can be had or taken for taking away or being in possession of any such apparel,"—(*Mr. Raikes*,)

—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

Sir HENRY JAMES said, he believed that this was the first time Parliament had ever been asked to legalize a breach of the Commandment, "Thou shalt not steal." The Amendment proposed to allow a woman living in a brothel to steal the clothes lent to her for immoral purposes, and there was to be no indictment. If hon. Members would look at the clause, they would see that no criminal proceedings were to be taken, so that the result would be that, in addition to the woman or child being a prostitute, they were to allow her to be a thief also. If the clothes were the property of another person, the woman ought not to be allowed to steal them without incurring the ordinary penalty of the law. A girl ought not to be entitled, because she was a prostitute, to pack up any quantity of clothes which did not belong to her, and walk off with them, without being liable to prosecution for stealing the clothes. He believed that the meaning of the right hon. Gentleman, and those who supported this clause, was that if there were power to claim civil damages they would stop it if they could. He did not for one moment imply that they were in favour of allowing women to steal clothes under the circumstances; but he pointed out that if the Amendment were accepted they would allow the clothes to be stolen without liability to prosecution. It was equivalent to saying that if a theft were committed it would be no crime.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON said, he had listened with attention to the argument of his right hon. and learned Friend (Sir Henry James) who had just sat down; but his right hon. and learned Friend ought not to forget that if the same clothes were supplied to a girl by the keeper of a brothel, on the understanding or the promise that she should pay for them, she might snap her fingers at the person who supplied them, because no Court of Law in the country would enforce a contract or liability incurred for an immoral consideration. Therefore, in another form it might be said that the law encouraged a girl to commit an immoral action. However, he would pass from the casuistical questions raised by his right hon. and learned Friend, and come to the practical question before the Committee—that was to say, whether something could not be done to bring pressure to bear on the persons who got women to lead an immoral life, and prevented their leaving it by threats of various kinds. That state of things, he said, ought to be met by the law; and he proposed to meet it by the clause of which he had given Notice. It went further than the clause of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge (Mr. Raikes) then before the Committee. It did not legalize theft, as the right hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James) had said was the result of that clause; but it said that the person who retained and kept any girl under restraint, or kept her in a brothel, or, by retaining her clothes, prevented her from leaving, should be guilty of a misdemeanour, and, being convicted, should be punished accordingly. He proposed that the offence should be dealt with and punished summarily. For these reasons, he should, with all submission, propose his own clause in substitution of the clause brought forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. and learned Gentleman would not be entitled to do that.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON said, he presumed that he could do so if the clause now before the Committee were withdrawn. He should propose his own clause if that of the right hon. Gentleman opposite were not adopted, because he believed it would be very efficacious in checking the evils which had been pointed out. If the right hon. Gentleman the

Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) had a clause which would meet the case he should be glad to accept it. He presumed they had only one object in view — namely, that of protecting the women in question, and vindicating the law.

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) said, the Government intended to propose a clause which would go farther in one direction than the clause before the Committee, which would leave the unfortunate girl still exposed to threats. The clause of the Government would be to the effect that—

> "Any person who detains any woman or girl against her will—(1) In or upon any premises, with intent that she may be unlawfully and carnally known by any man, whether any particular man or generally; or (2) In any brothel, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and, being convicted thereof, shall be liable, at the discretion of the Court, to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour."

And they proposed that—

> "Where a woman or girl is in or upon any premises, or in any brothel, a person should be deemed to detain such woman or girl in or upon such premises or in such brothel, if with intent to compel or induce her to remain in or upon such premises or in such brothel, such person withholds from such woman or girl any wearing apparel or other property belonging to her, or where wearing apparel has been lent or otherwise supplied to such woman or girl by or by the direction of such person, threatens such woman or girl with legal proceedings if she takes away with her the wearing apparel so lent or supplied."

And then would follow the words of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Cambridge—

> "That no criminal proceeding can be had or taken for taking away or being in possession of any such apparel."

He believed this proposal of the Government would meet the object which the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Raikes) and the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) had in view; and in commending it to the Committee he would remind the right hon. and learned Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James) that although the words "carrying away" occurred in the clause there was no mention of stealing.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON said, he was at a loss to understand why the words which he proposed were not added at the end of the clause. His object was to make it a punishable offence to threaten a girl. He could see no use in saying that criminal proceedings should not be taken if she kept the clothes supplied to her in a brothel. His proposal was to make it an offence to threaten proceedings, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary would accept the view embodied in his clause.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, after listening to the first part of the clause as read by the Under Secretary of State for the Home Office (Mr. Stuart-Wortley), he thought he preferred the wording of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon). He quite agreed with the desirability of stopping these threats of detaining clothes, and so preventing the girl leaving the house; but he should feel it his duty to take the sense of the Committee on the words—

> "That no criminal proceedings can be had or taken for taking away or being in possession of any such apparel."

He had admitted that these things took place, and he had admitted all that had been said against the practice. But if the woman said, "I object to your taking the clothes," and the girl went away with the clothes, he said there was no Judge in existence who would not say that technically it was a theft. He contended that they ought not to say that what was technically theft was not a great crime; and he asked the Government to consider whether they should not stop short of saying there should be no criminal proceedings if the clothes were taken away against the will of the owner. With regard to punishing the person making the threats, he would prefer the wording of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon).

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, he thought that what his hon. and learned Friend had proposed might be admissible; but he submitted that the words referring to criminal proceedings did not constitute an objection to the clause. It frequently happened that a woman had the use of a carriage and clothes. Actions had been brought for the hire of a brougham and clothes, and it had been held that no action would lie for either. He would go further, and say that no action of *detenu* could be brought for the clothes. He was dealing with the case of a girl walking away with clothes which did not belong to her. His right hon. and learned Friend proposed that the Amendment should not protect her if she took away mere necessaries. He (the Attorney General) ventured to say that that was not an objection which the Committee ought to accept. He would ask the Committee to pass the clause in the form proposed by the Government; and if there appeared to them reason for altering it in respect of the words declaring that no criminal proceedings should be taken it should be altered hereafter.

Mr. STAVELEY HILL pointed out that there was nothing in the proposed clause which would not allow a girl to take away any amount of clothing; and although no hon. Member would have any objection to that, yet it was a very strong measure to put into an Act of Parliament. He thought they had better leave the matter to the Judge and jury before whom it might be brought, feeling absolutely certain that the girl would not be convicted.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT asked the Attorney General to consider whether what they desired to accomplish—namely, that these girls should not be threatened—was not secured by the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon). He said they should desire to avoid legalizing in any form a criminal act. If they were to declare that criminal proceedings should not be taken in these cases it would be imagined very soon that they would not be taken in other cases. Surely they ought to set their faces against such a proposal as this. With regard to the taking of criminal proceedings, it was clear that if a woman were to take such measures against a girl, under the circumstances she would convict herself of being guilty of a misdemeanour. If that argument applied, he thought they might avoid the other alternative, which would be a summary alteration of the law of the country.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he thought that their present course should be to take the clause of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon). The clause which had been presented by his hon. Friend the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department was a long one, and until it was read it could not be fully understood, or, at all events, discussed. He therefore suggested that they should take the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury, and before the Report he would see to what extent the words of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Raikes) could be added to the clause.

Mr. MOLLOY said, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University (Mr. Raikes) would proceed with his Amendment. It had received the sanction of all hon. Members sitting around him, who considered that the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury did not touch the essence of the case. The gist of that Amendment was that it made it an offence on the part of the owner or occupier of the house to threaten to detain the clothes belonging to the girl. But there was no question about the clothes of the girl, because these would have been already taken away and others lent to her. The object of the right hon. Gentleman and his supporters was to deal with the clothes lent to the girl, and not with those belonging to the unfortunate woman herself. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Attorney General (Sir Henry James) had spoken of legalizing theft. That was one of the strangest remarks he had ever heard. The whole of the contract with the brothel-keeper was an immoral contract, and he did not wonder that hon. Members smiled when they heard his argument about breaking the Commandments. The whole thing was immoral, and he repeated that the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) did not touch the point they were aiming at—namely, the threats about the clothes that did not belong to the girl. He appealed to the hon. and learned Attorney General to accept the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Cambridge University that evening, and then, if any modification were necessary, let it be made on Report; but he could assure him in the meantime that the principle of that Amendment was such as he and his hon. Friends meant to insist upon, and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman who proposed it would not allow it to be deferred.

MR. RAIKES said, he should be prepared to save the Committee the time and trouble of dividing if he were to obtain from Her Majesty's Government a satisfactory assurance that the object at which he was aiming would be secured by the new clause to be proposed. But he was afraid that at the present time he was hardly in possession of that assurance. The object he had in view was distinct from that of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon), whose Amendment was directed entirely to the act of the brothel-keeper in detaining the girl and threatening to detain her clothes. But his own clause was intended to reach the minds of the persons concerned, and he had no doubt that many unfortunate women would not be slow to avail themselves of this provision as soon as they became sufficiently acquainted with it. He thought it was a mistake to suppose that it would not become known. There would doubtless be some cases in which its effect would not be reached immediately; but he imagined that this particular provision would become speedily known, and that a great many would avail themselves of it in order to quit a life of which they had become ashamed. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James) had said that his proposal was one for legalizing a breach of the Ten Commandments; but, although he regarded the right hon. and learned Gentleman as a great authority both on law and morality, he could not think that he had fairly construed the words of this particular clause. His (Mr. Raikes's) object was that no criminal proceedings should be had or taken for taking away necessary apparel, and he had not proposed in any way to legalize theft. He should be willing to accept words limiting the operation of the clause to such clothes as the woman might find it necessary to wear on the occasion of making her escape. He had no intention that the operation of the clause should extend so far as to enable her to pack up and take away clothes that were not necessary for making her escape. If he could obtain from the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department an assurance that he would embody in the clause of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury words which would secure the object he intended to reach by means of the words he had placed on the Paper—in that case he would not press this particular clause; but unless he could get that assurance from the Government he should feel justified in proceeding.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he understood that the object was to secure that a girl who took away with her only the amount of wearing apparel necessary should not be brought into a Criminal Court. If he understood the right hon. Gentleman correctly in forming that view, he was willing to go to that extent.

MR. BULWER said, he wished to point out, before the Committee passed from the present discussion, that such legislation as was proposed was utterly unnecessary. No one supposed for one moment that a girl wishing to leave a brothel would hesitate to take the clothes that were necessary for her. There was no magistrate in the Kingdom who would commit her under the circumstances. He sympathized with those who desired to prevent the girl being kept in a brothel; but that was dealt with by the Amendment of his hon. and learned Friend opposite (Mr. Serjeant Simon). But it was not alone with innocent girls that they had to deal; there were artful girls in these places as well as others, and there was no doubt that many an artful girl who heard that there was legislation of the kind proposed would walk off with what clothes she liked, because she would know there was no possibility of punishing her. He did not say that the clause was not right in its object; he pointed out that it was quite unnecessary, because even if a case of the kind were brought before Quarter Sessions, or before a Judge and jury, there would be no chance of obtaining a conviction unless it was shown that the girl had taken away a great deal more than what was necessary for her to go away with. He said that neither in law nor morality would there be any criminality in leaving with the clothes necessary for her escape; if she took more it would be a question to be decided by the Court in the ordinary way.

Mr. RAIKES said, he understood from the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department that he was willing to introduce words into the clause of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon) which would effect the object he had in view, of preventing legal proceedings being taken against a girl who took away such wearing apparel as might be necessary. If he was correct in that, he had no wish farther to occupy the time of the Committee, and would ask leave to withdraw his Motion.

Mr. DWYER GRAY said, he wished to point out, before the clause was withdrawn, that the promise of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary did not meet the case. Neither, in his opinion, did either of the Amendments. What they wanted was to combine the principle of the two Amendments. The mere providing for the taking away of clothes was not sufficient, because the point was that the girl should not be threatened that a prosecution would ensue unless she remained. The Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury only provided against the detention of the girl's own clothes, whereas they wanted to deal with the clothes which the brothel-keeper lent her. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary would see his way to combine the essence of both clauses. It was impossible to get a knowledge of the law home to the migratory population of these houses, which were constantly recruited by girls who had no means of knowing the law. But the brothel-keepers would know the law well enough, and it seemed to him necessary to go beyond the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury by dealing with the clothes lent by them. Unless they did that they would do nothing, for those persons knew that they could not prosecute the girl for taking away the clothes she was wearing. Therefore, he hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would meet his wishes and those of his hon. Friends by combining the two clauses.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

The CHAIRMAN: I am of opinion that the clause standing in the name of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) does not come within the purview of the Bill, and that it cannot, therefore, be moved.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he would ask whether he could divide the Committee on the Amendment, or what steps he should take to get a decision upon it?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, it would save the time of the Committee if he stated that it was just as well that they should have some law of this kind. He would bring up an Amendment of a similar kind on Report.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he had another clause on the Paper dealing with the cessation of parental authority. It was as follows:—

> "In all cases where it can be proved that the carnal connection of an unmarried girl under the age of twenty-one with a man has been encouraged, favoured, or facilitated by the father, mother, or guardian, such father, mother, or guardian shall cease to have any authority over her."

He had given Notice of another clause on the same subject, but he did not see it on the Paper. He could, however, move it here. It was—

> "And in such cases where the girl is under the age of sixteen any magistrate shall have authority on proof of the offence to send her to a reformatory or industrial school, or to commit her to the custody of any person or persons whom he may think fit until the age of seventeen."

It seemed to him that this Bill had a very great defect. It punished those who seduced young girls, and those who induced them to go into houses of ill-fame; but it did not in any sort of way say what was to be done with the girls themselves. It might be said that the parents or guardians of a girl would be punished if they sold her for improper purposes; but there were many other ways in which the defilement of a girl might be "encouraged, favoured, or facilitated" besides by selling her. The magistrate who heard the case might come to the conclusion that it had been the intention of the parent or guardian to allow the girl to engage in these offences; and under such circumstances he did not think the guardian ought any longer to have authority over the girl. At the same time, if they deprived such parent or guardian of all authority, they must place authority somewhere else—they must either vest it in the magistrate, or, if the girl was determined to hold to the life, and was under the age of 16, they must give him power, in the words of this Amendment—

> "To send her to a reformatory or industrial school, or to commit her to the custody of any person or persons whom he may think fit, until the age of seventeen."

Because there were now a considerable number of homes to which girls of this kind could be sent, and they could send her to one of these if it was not thought desirable to commit her to a reformatory. He limited his Amendment to cases where the girl was under the age of 16 years and up to her attaining 17 years of age; but in all cases where the girl was under 21 he would deprive parents and guardians of all authority over her. Perhaps the Committee would allow him to add this to the clause, and to move it altogether.

New Clause (Cessation of parental authority,)—(*Mr. Labouchere,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, he could not advise the Committee to accept the clause. He would point out to the Committee and the hon. Member that the issue under the clause would be a thoroughly collateral one to the issue being tried by the magistrate—namely, the guilt of the seducer; and it was doubtful whether, in many cases, it would be raised. Although he sympathized with the hon. Member's object, the words of the clause were vague, and would be found unworkable. The hon. Member did not say what would become of the obligations of the father. They would not wish to get rid of these obligations because of the man's misconduct. In nine cases out of ten he did not think it would be possible for the magistrate to try this collateral issue; and though he admitted it would be well to cast a stigma, if possible, on the father, he thought the clause would not operate if it were passed.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he had taken the clause out of the French Criminal Code. What, he asked, was to be done with these particular girls? Take a girl of 13. A man was accused of having seduced her; it was admitted that it had been done in the worst way —that it had been "encouraged, favoured, or facilitated by the father, mother, or guardian"—was the girl then to be sent back to the custody of this father, mother, or guardian? That seemed to him to be rather a strange thing to do. He did not wish to pin himself to this particular clause; but he did think that something ought to be done in the Bill—or, if they liked, in some subsequent Bill, if it was too late now—to meet the question of what was to be done with these girls.

Captain PRICE thought there was a great deal to be said in favour of the latter portion of the clause moved by the hon. Gentleman. In fact, he had proposed to move a clause giving effect to what the hon. Member (Mr. Labouchere) had just stated. He had desired to insert a new clause after Clause 5; but, no doubt, it would come in very well where the hon. Gentleman proposed. They had raised the age of protection from 15 to 16; and he had sought on Friday night to make that provision applicable to girls who were not prostitutes. There was no doubt there was a great number of those girls—namely, prostitutes under the age of 16 years, who were so with the connivance and encouragement of their parents. As the hon. Gentleman had said, some punishment should be provided for these girls. Certainly they ought not to be sent back to the custody of their parents, but should be detained in a house of correction or reformatory. They should remember that the legislation they were passing now was not solely for people in well-to-do circumstances who went and deliberately debauched young girls, but that it was for the whole community—for the boys of the working classes as well as others. He was quite certain that it would be found in all large garrison towns, and in many other places, that frequent cases would arise of extortion practised by young girls and their parents under the Act. He would point out a case that he thought would be a very common one. A man had improper relations with a young girl under 16—15 and a-half, say —a precocious, well-advanced, and well-developed girl, who looked more like a woman of 17 or 18. But the man knew perfectly well that she was under 16. He (Captain Price) did not wish to complicate the matter with a question as to default of knowledge. He would as-moral purposes. He maintained that those who let their property for such purposes were as bad, or worse, than the occupiers, and it was only right that the Act should, accordingly, be extended to them. He understood that the Government were prepared to meet the object he had in view, to a certain extent, by substituting words for the purpose in another portion of the Act; and if they did that, and the words were made strong enough, he should have no objection to withdraw his clause. He felt himself that the imposition of a heavy fine would very often prevent these people from letting their houses for improper purposes. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary would permit him to say that, as he desired the clause to be applied to brothels or houses to be used for immoral purposes, he hoped that before the Bill passed he would take care that the definitions were strong enough and wide enough to cover all these places.

New Clause (Suppression of brothels,)—(*Mr. Grafton,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, if this clause were withdrawn, he should on Report move to introduce words as to ownership as in Clause 12, which dwelt with the occupier.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Member withdraw the clause?

MR. GRAFTON: Yes.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. SERJEANT SIMON said, he would move the insertion of the following new Clause:—

"Any owner or occupier, or any person having or acting, or assisting in the management or control of any brothel, house, or premises, or any person who shall keep any woman or girl under restraint in any brothel, house, or premises, or shall prevent, or threaten to prevent, any woman or girl from leaving any brothel, house, or premises, or shall detain her clothes or other property in order to prevent her from leaving such brothel, house, or premises, or to compel or induce her to remain in any brothel, or to compel or induce her to remain for immoral purposes in any house or premises, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, being convicted thereof, shall be liable, at the discretion of the court, to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years with or without hard labour."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): That clause will be put in the Bill—the effect of it.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON: Then I will not move it.

MR. JAMES STUART: In the absence of Mr. William Fowler—["Order, order!"]—the hon. Member for Cambridge, I beg to move the following Clause in his name:—

"(1.) Every man who, in any thoroughfare or public place within the limits of the Metropolitan Police District, habitually or persistently solicits women or girls for immoral purposes, shall be deemed to commit an offence under section fifty-four of the Act of the Session of the second and third years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter forty-seven, intituled 'An Act for further improving the Police in and near the Metropolis.'

"(2.) Every man who, in any street within any town or district wherein section twenty-eight of 'The Town Police Clauses Act, 1847,' is in force, habitually or persistently importunes or solicits women or girls for immoral purposes, shall be deemed to commit an offence under the same section."

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member cannot move this now. He must wait his turn—that is to say, he must wait until the Amendments on the Paper are disposed of.

MR. PICTON said, he begged to move the following Clause:—

"Every person charged with an offence under this Act, and the wife of the person so charged, shall be competent witnesses on every hearing at every stage of such charge: Provided, That no person so charged shall be compellable to be a witness on any such hearing: Provided also, That no person so charged, being a witness on any hearing of such charge, shall have the right to refuse to answer any question on the ground that it would tend to criminate him as to the offence so charged, unless the court before whom such hearing shall take place shall think fit."

It had been said in connection with various parts of the Bill that it would give occasion for false accusations against people. Instances had been adduced of special cases of conflicting testimony in which, had the person charged and his wife been competent witnesses, all suspicious circumstances would have been explained, and a miscarriage of justice would have been prevented. In some cases already the accused was allowed to give testimony for himself—in cases of adultery, for instance, and in many cases of conspiracy. It appeared to him that offences charged under this measure were especially offences on which such testimony ought to be allowed, and, therefore, it was that he moved the clause. He should like to add after the word "wife," in the first line, "or husband, as the case may be," because, in some cases, women might be accused under some of the clauses. He might add that the wording of the clause was taken directly from the Bill which had received the assent of the other House of Parliament, and had received, he believed, the sanction of this House, but which had not been carried to its final stage.

New Clause (Person charged and his wife shall be competent witnesses,)—(*Mr. Picton,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he should not at all like to say what his view of this new clause was. In his opinion it was right, in some cases, to allow the accused to give evidence; and he thought, therefore, that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Leicester (Mr. Picton) would do well to allow the merits of his proposal to be considered. It certainly would seem that of all classes of cases that dealt with in this Bill was the one in which the defendant should be allowed to give evidence. As he had said, the principle had been allowed in some instances—in affiliation cases, where it was sought to fix the paternity of illegitimate children on certain persons; and in cases where charges of sending unseaworthy ships to sea were made the defendant was allowed to speak for himself. He wished to say this, in view of an Amendment negatived by a small majority the other day—that to prevent a child giving evidence—that if there was one reason why he felt why the House should be in favour of this clause, it was because he thought the guilty would be detected just as well, whilst the innocent might more readily escape. He remembered once being in a case with one of the best men who ever practised at the Criminal Bar—namely, Mr. Serjeant Parry—at the York Assizes. The case was one of sending unseaworthy ships to sea; and Serjeant Parry had pointed out that where permission was given to a defendant to give evidence, and he did not do so, the conclusion to be drawn was that he was in the wrong. He could not help thinking that in cases where the evidence of a small child was taken, the statement of the prisoner himself would be of value. Where guilty he would be likely to say nothing—so that the provision would enable the innocent man to get off, and aid the conviction of the guilty. With regard to the Proviso—

> "No person so charged, being a witness on any hearing of such charge, shall have the right to refuse to answer any question on the ground that it would tend to criminate him as to the offence so charged," &c.

That, he thought, should be left to the discretion of the Judge at the trial. He thought the clause proposed by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Southwark (Mr. Thorold Rogers) the better form of clause—namely,

> "Any person charged with any offence under this Act shall be a competent witness on his own behalf: Provided always, That no such person shall be compelled to give evidence."

As the Committee was principally concerned, the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary would say whether he agreed to the clause, or the principle of it.

MR. PICTON desired to point out that the concluding lines expressly gave power to decline to give such evidence.

MR. M'COAN entirely agreed with the principle involved in the first lines of the Amendment, but strongly objected to the end of it. He ventured to suggest that the intention of the hon. Member would be carried out if the clause were amended in this way—"Every person charged," and so on, "shall be competent but not compellable witnesses," &c. Of course, in the case of a witness refusing to give evidence, the inference would be very strong against him.

MR. TOMLINSON pointed out that, in accepting this Amendment, they were making a very serious alteration in the jurisprudence of the country. He did not see how the argument of the hon. and learned Attorney General applied, because affiliation summonses were not criminal cases.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) wished to explain that he had also mentioned the charge of sending an unseaworthy ship to sea, which was certainly a criminal offence.

Mr. TOMLINSON felt it his duty, nevertheless, to warn the Committee that in putting this clause into the Bill, they were practically conceding the admission of the prisoner's evidence in all criminal cases.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) hoped the Committee would accept the clause. When it had been read a second time, he should move to strike out the last portion of it.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. M'COAN wished to move an Amendment in the first line of the clause, so that it would read—

"Every person charged with an offence under this Act, and the wife or husband of the person so charged," &c.

Mr. STAVELEY HILL thought the Home Secretary would find it necessary to slightly amend this clause on Report. He thought the right hon. Gentleman would find that, under the clause as it stood, there would be no power of cross-examining these witnesses. He was under the impression that there was some particular form of words to be put in a clause of this sort to enable this to be done.

Question put, "After the word 'and,' in line 1, to insert 'if married,'" and *agreed to.*

Question put, "After the word 'wife,' in line 1, insert 'or husband,'" and *agreed to.*

Mr. M'COAN moved, in line 2 of the new clause, after the word "competent," to insert the words "but not compellable."

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. HOPWOOD thought the Committee would make a great mistake if they made these class of persons competent but not compellable witnesses. He would put it to the Home Secretary, who would see at once what he meant. There was a prosecution against a man who was not called as a witness. The counsel prosecuting would be able to say—"Where is the prisoner? He might have been called; I could not call him, but my learned friend could have done so; and, as he has not been called, I say it amounts practically to a confession of guilt." That would be a great injustice to the prisoner. The only way in which they could make the clause workable at all was by inserting the words "competent or compellable." They ought to give the prisoner no choice in the matter, as they would be doing him a great injustice if they gave him a discretion. Juries did not always understand the fencing of opposing counsel; and if they were told that the defence could have called the prisoner, they would naturally come to the conclusion that they had some very good reason for not doing so. He ventured to warn the Committee that if they adopted the principle that the prisoner was not to give evidence unless he liked, it would be found that they had not conferred the benefit on him which they intended in giving him the power of rebutting the evidence against him.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, there was no doubt that where an accused person was competent to be a witness and was not called, it raised a presumption against him; but, in administering the Criminal Law, they wished to give protection to an innocent man, and they could not deny that a provision like this was of the greatest value to enable a man to prove his innocence. If a man were innocent, he would appear to give evidence; but if he were guilty he would not appear; and if they forced a guilty man into the witness-box, whether he liked it or not, they would be subjecting him to the temptation to commit perjury, and thus rendering him liable to the additional penalty attaching to that offence. That was a pressure to which he ought not to be exposed.

Mr. LYULPH STANLEY thought that this clause would be valuable in any shape at all, and hoped there would not be too much criticism of detail. It would be such a great step in regard to their Criminal Law that he hoped it would not be too much criticized. They knew that in civil cases it was not supposed to be the duty of the plaintiff to call the defendant, although he knew a great deal about the case at issue. It was the business of the defendant to call himself. He had some doubt in regard to the cross-examination, for they knew how the people were occasionally shocked by the cross-examination of a prisoner by the Judge in France. He thought, however, that public opinion in England would keep the counsel for the prosecution in check. Under all the circumstances, he hoped they would accept the Amendment.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question, "That all the words after the word 'charge,' in line 3, be struck out," put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. STAVELEY HILL moved to insert, after the word "charge," at the end of the clause, the words

"And if tendering himself or herself as a witness, shall be subject to cross-examination."

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. HOPWOOD said, that surely this followed as a matter of course. If a witness gave evidence, he would be subject to cross-examination in the ordinary way.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) was bound to say that he was of the same opinion as the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood); but if the hon. and learned Member thought the words necessary, he had no objection.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, it would be necessary, then, to insert words to enable a re-examination. He would really ask the hon. and learned Member to withdraw his Amendment.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, he had been all through this matter, and there was really no necessity for the Amendment.

Amendment *negatived.*

Sir HENRY JAMES said, he would not move any further Amendment on this clause now; but he would do so on the Report, because it ought to be made clear that the prisoner could be examined at every hearing. At present he was rather afraid that there might be a difficulty about the Grand Jury where the prisoner did not appear. He was so glad to get this alteration in the law, however, that he would not take up the time of the Committee now, but would consult with the Attorney General, and move some Amendment at the later stage.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, be added to the Bill."

Mr. WARTON pointed out that they were now making a most startling change in their Law of Evidence. The clause introduced so vital a change that he was surprised at the ease with which the Attorney General and the ex-Attorney General had seen their way to desert the principles which had hitherto formed the bases of their criminal legislation. The two important principles involved in this clause should certainly not be introduced into a measure which they were hurrying through Parliament as they were hurrying that one. He did hope the Committee would pause. All the other questions in this Bill did not together amount to the same importance as the great and grave principles which they were now introducing into it. No more startling innovation had been made in their Criminal Law for centuries, and he could not allow the clause to pass without entering his earnest protest against it. He warned them of the state of things which happened in France, where the Judge cross-examined the prisoners in a most infamous manner. Next year he would undertake to say they would have the same sort of thing in their Courts. They would have lawyers cross-examining these unfortunate criminals in the same infamous style. It was a return to the same state of things as existed in the old days of the Inquisition in France, and was quite too serious a change to be introduced into such a wretched Bill as this, which, after all the noise and fuss that had been made about it, might not produce any startling results, or, if it did, stood a very good chance of being repealed in a very short time. The principle of the Bill was sure to be abandoned when the public returned to their common sense. In the meantime, he stood aghast and horrified at the action which had been taken by the right hon. Gentlemen of the Legal Profession on this occasion.

Sir HENRY JAMES altogether denied that they were acting in a hurry in this matter. The clause had in the shape of a Bill received the approval of the House of Lords twice before, and it had received the approval of the Criminal Code Commissioners. It had also been inserted in the Explosives Act, and its introduction into that measure had been the direct means of establishing the innocence of a man charged under that Act.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON asked whether this clause ought not to be carried further? They were going to allow a prisoner to give evidence on his own behalf in a class of cases of the nature of rape, but they did not allow him to do the same thing in the actual case of rape itself.

Sir HENRY JAMES wished to point out to the hon. and learned Gentleman that they could not, while this Bill was in Committee, extend this clause to prisoners charged with rape; but they might do on Report.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON insisted that it was a most extraordinary and invidious thing that they should allow the principle in these cases, but that in the case of actual rape, when the man might be the only person who could thoroughly explain the matter, they should not allow it.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH, with the permission of the Committee, begged leave to move the Clause standing in the name of the hon. Member for Cambridge (Mr. William Fowler), which was as follows:—

"(1.) Every man who, in any thoroughfare or public place within the limits of the Metropolitan Police District, habitually or persistently solicits women or girls for immoral purposes, shall be deemed to commit an offence under section fifty-four of the Act of the Session of the second and third years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter forty-seven, intituled 'An Act for further improving the Police in and near the Metropolis.'

"(2.) Every man who, in any street within any town or district wherein section twenty-eight of 'The Town Police Clauses Act, 1847,' is in force, habitually or persistently importunes or solicits women or girls for immoral purposes, shall be deemed to commit an offence under the same section."

Mr. WARTON rose to Order, and submitted to the Chair that the Committee had decided this matter when they struck out Clause 9 with regard to solicitation.

The CHAIRMAN said, he was not in the Chair when Clause 9 was struck out; but he now saw it referred to the same thing, and therefore the hon. Member would not be in Order in moving this Amendment. The principle of the matter had already been rejected by striking out Clause 9.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he had a short clause to move. Under a previous clause, the age at which consent could be urged as a defence to an indecent assault had been raised from 13 to 16. It would be necessary, therefore, to put in a few words to make it meet the case of young persons of 16 under this Bill. Therefore, he moved the following words:—

"Consent to be no defence to a charge of indecent assault on a young person below the age specified in this Act."

Mr. HOPWOOD asked whether the right hon. Gentleman proposed that a woman could be charged with familiarity with a boy of 16 years of age, and consent was to be no defence? He hardly knew what they were coming to. This clause opened up a vista of new ideas in regard to the relations of the sexes which Parliament had never dreamed of. He did not know whether those who were responsible for this Bill knew where they were going to stop, or where this whirlwind was to cease. For his part, he thought it would be advisable for the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary to leave this matter alone, at all events for the present, and if they found that there was any necessity for dealing with it, they could amend the Act at some later period.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would reconsider this matter and bring it up on Report. If the offence took place, it might generally be proved by direct evidence.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. STAVELEY HILL said, he had been about to bring forward a clause providing for the punishment of a man who did an act tending to the commission of a midemeanour; but he would bring it up on Report.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he had an Amendment to propose the object of which was to provide that no person should be convicted of an offence under the 2nd and 3rd sections of the Act upon the evidence of one witness only. It had been observed a short time ago by the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) that the Committee hardly knew where they were going in the matter of this Bill. In some respects he quite agreed in that opinion of the hon. and learned Gentleman. As far as the 2nd and 3rd sections of the Bill were concerned, they were founding an enactment of a kind which he supposed had never before received the sanction of Parliament. By those clauses the door was opened to all sorts of extortion and fraud, especially since the existing limitation of the age of women had been repealed. Now, he proposed to tack on to the two clauses the Amendment which he had described. However, if his right hon. Friend did not wish him to move it then, he would do so later; but in the meantime he wished to express his views upon the subject. He had adopted in this case the principle contained in the former Bill brought in by the late Government, and adopted by the present Government, as would be seen on reference to Clause 9—the Solicitation Clause—which repealed portions of the Town Police Clauses Act of 1847. The Bill substituted other clauses, and also provided that a conviction should not take place in pursuance of the section in question on the evidence of one witness only. He understood that that Proviso was introduced for the protection of women, and the Proviso he had to propose was intended for the protection of men. He believed that there was nothing new in this. So far as regarded Scotland, he was told by the late Lord Advocate (Mr. J. B. Balfour) that no person could be convicted there criminally, on the evidence of one witness only, without there was some corroborative evidence; but, as he had said before, they were, by these two clauses, opening the door to all sorts of extortion. It should be remembered that if there was one characteristic in women of the unfortunate class more noticeable than another it was untruthfulness, as any person would be aware who had taken the trouble to inquire into the matter, or who like himself had sat on a Committee for the purpose of considering this question, or who had inquired at the Homes where this class of women were received. It was a well-known fact that these persons were not all credible persons; and it seemed to him that there was very great danger that false charges might be brought by such women utterly unsupported by any evidence, and convictions obtained against innocent men. Hon. Members knew that in cases of breach of promise of marriage, a good-looking lady had an extremely good chance of getting heavy damages; and he thought it was more than probable that when a good-looking prosecutrix showed herself in the witness-box in support of a charge under these clauses, there would be a very bad chance for the defendant or prisoner as the case might be. Instances of charges of the kind unsupported by reliable evidence were very common, as might be seen by reference to a newspaper that had been mentioned once or twice in the course of the evening, and described by an hon. and learned Friend in a speech made the other night as a "magazine of filth." On Friday last there was a column in *The Pall Mall Gazette* devoted to an alleged case of ruining a young girl; and if hon. Gentlemen would be kind enough to read this story, they would find that the whole case depended entirely on the testimony of one witness—that was to say, of the girl alleged to have been injured. When he considered that they had not alone to deal with artless young girls, but with artful and immoral women of a notoriously untruthful class, he thought that some additional protection should be given to persons who were likely to be inculpated. Therefore, he had prepared a clause which he begged to move, and in which was incorporated a principle already adopted by Act of Parliament in England, and in operation in another part of the United Kingdom.

New Clause:—

"That no person shall be convicted of an offence under the second and third sections of this Act upon the evidence of one witness only,"—(*Mr. Cavendish Bentinck,*)

—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he should have thought that the right hon. and learned Gentleman would have known that, if this clause was unnecessary in the case of ordinary offences, it was unnecessary in the case of rape. He should not like to see this clause placed on the Statute Book. He did not believe that a Judge would ever allow a person to be convicted under these sections upon the uncorroborated testimony of one witness.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, there were within his own knowledge several instances of what the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Whitehaven had alluded to. Some time ago he had had occasion to attend one of the Police Courts when a case of indecent exposure was before the magistrate; the sole witness was a highly respectable woman, and the magistrate said aloud to the clerk that he believed it was the rule of magistrates not to entertain charges of the sort unless they were proved by two persons. The clerk replied in the affirmative, and the magistrate dismissed the prosecution. These instances were very common, especially with regard to the relations of the sexes. He reminded the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary to the Home Department that this was a matter in which he had had to interfere on several occasions. There had been charges of assault in railway carriages. Within the last few months a respectable gentleman had been charged, his name appeared in the papers, and he had to submit to all the disagreeable consequences, and although he was not allowed to give evidence he had succeeded in rebutting the charge by the force of character. There was another instance which occurred when the right hon. Gentleman was last Secretary of State for the Home Department. It was the case of Seth Evans. He had interested himself in that case on behalf of a great number of people who did not believe the story against him. The man had been sentenced to two years' imprisonment; and after two trials for perjury against the girl, in which the jury could not agree, the right hon. Gentleman said the case was not made out—that it was completely rebutted in his mind—and the man was discharged. If there was a case in law which entitled them to ask for peculiar treatment it was this. If they were to make these things the subject of legislation, it seemed to him that they demanded special and peculiar treatment. He believed that as the House went on educating itself it would see that what was at first so clear had become fraught with great danger, and that those dangers were now unfolding themselves.

Mr. J. B. BALFOUR said, that having been appealed to by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) to say whether his view of the case with regard to Scotland was correct, he had to say that the right hon. and learned Gentleman had correctly stated the case. According to Scotch law there must be two witnesses, or one witness whose evidence was corroborated, in order to warrant a conviction. As a general rule two witnesses were requisite. He understood the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary to say that although there was no technical rule to the same effect in England, the like practice obtained there, and that a direction would not be given by a Judge to find any person guilty on the unsupported testimony of one witness. He thought it desirable to know whether in such cases the liberty of a man would solely depend upon the arbitrament of the Judge, or whether he would not have the protection of a definite rule of law to the effect that the uncorroborated testimony of a single witness was not sufficient?

Mr. STAVELEY HILL said, he was sorry to differ from the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department in anything connected with the law; but he was obliged to say that in this matter the right hon. Gentleman was entirely wrong. He (Mr. Staveley Hill) supposed that there was no hon. and learned Member having experience of criminal trials who did not know there had been convictions for rape that were absolutely wrong. He had one case distinctly before his mind. It was a case in which he was counsel, and where the man was convicted on a cock-and-bull story and sentenced to penal servitude. There was not the slightest corroboration of the woman's story; and although he had done his best to get a remission of the sentence, the man had to suffer five years' penal servitude for a crime of which he was, in his opinion, absolutely innocent. There was no requirement that there should be corroboration of the woman's evidence and no understanding that there should be any corroboration, and if a woman got into the witness-box, and her evidence could not be broken down be cross-examination, the man would be absolutely certain to be convicted. He entreated the Committee to take into consideration the arguments brought forward by the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood), and to consider how dangerous it would be to apply that system in the cases which they had then before them. As the Bill now stood, the girl, who might be a consenting party, might come forward and give evidence, upon which alone, as there was nothing to require the evidence of a second witness, a man might be convicted and sentenced. Unless the clause proposed by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) were added to the Bill, he feared there would be many cases in which serious injustice would be done.

MR. GREGORY said, there were some reasons why a clause of the kind proposed by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck) should be added to the Bill, as applying to some of the acts dealt with. For instance, with regard to the administering of drugs and other matters, it was a very common thing for a girl to state that drugs had been administered to her, and that she had been violated under those circumstances. If she was to be allowed to tell that story without corroboration, it might lead to a serious miscarriage of justice. As they had not the exact words of the clause before them, it was rather a difficult matter to form an opinion upon, and he would therefore suggest that the question should be raised on the Report, so as to give hon. Members an opportunity of deciding what words should be added to the Bill.

MR. ONSLOW said, he was sorry the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had not accepted the clause in the form in which it had been read. He hoped that on Report words would be adopted to meet the views of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck). The right hon. Gentleman said, in the case of rape, no corroborative evidence was necessary. But with regard to the other cases, if they did not take care, the Bill would simply become the means of extortion as against men, whom it was their duty to protect as well as women. He thought it a monstrous injustice that a girl without any corroborative evidence should be able to bring a charge against a man, and probably get a conviction. He would remind the right hon. Gentleman that if a provision of this kind were introduced into the Bill, a girl would not be so likely to bring a false charge against a man as she would be if she could get a man convicted on her own statement alone. He perfectly agreed with the hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory) that, on the whole, some provision of the kind should be put into the Bill; and, for the protection of men and the prevention of extortion, he hoped that the right hon. and learned Gentleman's clause would be carried.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he had not heard all the discussion on this clause; but his right hon. Friend had given him the meaning of the Amendment, which he understood to be that no person should be convicted under the 2nd and 3rd clauses of the Act on the evidence of one person only. He was not aware that any Statute had ever provided that no conviction should take place on the evidence of one witness only. He was bound to say that the Amendment really provided that there must be more than one witness, and that, so far as he knew, was an entire anomaly. The practical outcome of the discussion was that no Judge would allow a case under these clauses to go on without corroboration. ["No, no!"] Although he agreed with the hon. Gentleman behind him that there was no rule that there must be a second witness, yet all those acquainted with criminal practice would know that no Judge would allow a case of the kind to go to the jury upon the uncorroborated evidence of one witness. Corroboration did not mean that there should be another witness—they had experience of that in the Divorce Court, and in cases of breach of promise of marriage, where corroborative evidence was necessary. With all respect to hon. Members who thought otherwise, he said again that a Judge would not allow one of these cases to go to the jury without there was corroboration in fact of some kind or other. That corroboration might arise from a variety of circumstances, as, for instance, from the fact of the prisoner being found close to the spot. But, however it might arise, he said that they would be introducing into the Bill matter which ought not to be introduced into it, if they put in a provision that more than one witness should be called. The hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr.

Gregory) had very properly said that a great distinction ought to be drawn between cases in which the mouth of the defendant was closed and where it was not. If the right hon. and learned Gentleman's clause became law, no case could go to a jury upon the evidence of one witness, and he submitted that the person who made the accusation should be able to explain the circumstances and give evidence.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, he felt a great deal of interest in this question, and, on the whole, he was rather inclined to favour the clause proposed by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Whitehaven (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck). But he did not quite agree with what had fallen from his hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General. He thought he was wrong in saying that Judges had not over and over again allowed persons to be convicted on the evidence of one person without corroboration. He recollected a case in which a man was convicted under those circumstances. Again, he did not understand the distinction which his hon. and learned Friend drew between a second witness and corroboration. Corroboration must exist in the mouth of a second witness, or else there would be only one statement. How could there be corroborative evidence of the worth of testimony, unless it came from a second witness? Any corroboration of the evidence of one witness must come from another witness. Certainly he was unable to see the distinction drawn by his hon. and learned Friend. In bastardy cases two witnesses were required, although the accused person might be examined; and if they insisted on two witnesses in that case, he did not see why the same principle should not be applied to the 2nd and 3rd clauses of this Bill. As to the rule in Scotland, he believed it had worked well, and there was a good deal to be said in favour of it, because, although it was much to be hoped that all Judges would hesitate to go on the statement of one person, they did not always do that. He should consider the proposal of the right hon. and learned Gentleman, and, if he could, he should vote for the clause.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he did not propose to press his clause upon the Committee on that occasion. He should put it on the Paper for consideration on Report. He did not wish to add a word to the arguments adduced in favour of his clause by his right hon. and learned Friend; but he must express his surprise that the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary seemed to set his face so strongly against a clause intended to prevent extortion. He did not wish to detain the Committee by any further observations. He would withdraw the clause now, and bring it up again on Report.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Schedule.

Mr. WARTON proposed to add, after "forty-nine," "and section fifty-five." The other evening something was said about the Consolidated Statutes of 1861. It ought to be said in justice to the memory of Mr. Grey, who drew the Code, that there never was a better series of Statutes drawn than the seven or eight Statutes which had formed for so many years their Criminal Law. [Sir R. Assheton Cross: It is already repealed.] If it was already repealed, they had had no law respecting abduction since it was repealed. When was it repealed? The Home Secretary had passed him the Statutes, and he found 55 still standing. He was perfectly correct, and on questions of Criminal Law he generally was right, because he knew the Criminal Law well. Was it the intention of those who brought forward this Bill that they should have two sections dealing with abductions? It seemed to him that when the promoters of this Bill drew their Abduction Clause — Clause 7 — which fixed the age at 18, they forgot the existence of s. 55, c. 100, 24 & 25 *Vict.*

Amendment proposed, to add, after "section forty-nine," in the Schedule, "and section fifty-five."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he thought the hon. and learned Gentleman was alluding to Section 51, and that was what he had in his mind when he said the section was repealed. It was intended to keep Section 55, because the offence it dealt with was quite different to that dealt with by Clause 7 of this

Bill. Section 55 was general in its terms—namely,

> "Whosoever shall unlawfully take or cause to be taken any unmarried girl out of the possession and against the will of her father or mother, or any other person having the lawful care or charge of her;"

but Clause 7 of this Bill made it a misdemeanour for anyone to do the same thing—

> "With intent that she should be unlawfully and carnally known by any man."

The hon. and learned Gentleman would see that the two sections were very different.

MR. WARTON remarked, that Section 55 was never used except in cases of abduction for sexual purposes. Practically it was now intended to have two abduction sections, one fixing the age at 16 and the other fixing it at 18.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill, as amended, be reported to the House."

MR. WILLIAMSON said, that as the Bill applied to Scotland he desired to put a question to the late Lord Advocate (Mr. J. B. Balfour). He was told that the evidence of children of tender years, without the solemnity of an oath, was admissible in Scotland. The other night it was resolved by a very narrow majority that such evidence should not be allowed under the operation of this Bill. He would like to know what the law of Scotland was on this point? If it was as he had suggested, would it not be well to consider on Report the advisability of assimilating the law of England to that of Scotland, especially as it was admitted that the law of Scotland was generally better than that of England?

MR. J. B. BALFOUR said, his hon. Friend had been correctly informed. It was not essential that a child of tender years should take the oath. The custom in cases where a child was concerned was for the Judge to put some questions to the child in a kindly fashion in order to ascertain its state of education and intelligence, and if it was fit to take the oath the oath was administered. If it was too young to understand the nature of an oath, but the Judge thought it understood the obligation to tell the truth, it was examined without being put upon oath, but after being admonished to tell the truth. Of course, the evidence was given in the presence of the jury, so that they could form an opinion as to its worth. He was quite sure that there were many cases in which the truth would not be reached unless the evidence of the child were taken, and it was in that view he gave a vote in favour of the Amendment the other night. If on Report the proposal was made to allow a child of tender years to give evidence without being sworn, he should again vote for it.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered upon *Wednesday,* and to be *printed.* [Bill 257.]

SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND BILL.

[*Lords.*] — [BILL 242.]

(*Secretary Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR: The second reading of this Bill was brought on so unexpectedly that I was then the only Scotch Member on this side of the House, and there was no discussion. This debate involves the principle of the Bill. I do not profess to see its necessity or to support its general provisions, while I ardently oppose some of them. No doubt, it has numerous supporters in Scotland. I know of no country which has made so much progress as Scotland since it became an integral part of Great Britain, united with England in interests, in feeling, and in administration. Undoubtedly, that administration had to be carried on with a knowledge of local differences in law and in the habits of the people; and, on the whole, through the Ministerial functions of the Lord Advocate and the vigilance of Scotch Members of Parliament, Scotland has largely had its own way as to its peculiarities; but has gained vastly in solidarity and prosperity by accepting its position as an integral part of Great Britain. This Bill is intended to accentuate the differences between England and Scotland for the future, and, in my opinion, it will tend to convert Scotland into a Province, with the narrower peculiarities of Provincial existence. No country can less afford than Scotland to narrow the ambition of its educated classes or to parochialize its institutions. If it separates itself from England in administration and education it need not be surprised if in time England becomes less of an outlet for Scotch enterprize. I doubt altogether the wisdom of such a separation, though I admit that a certain demand for it exists in Scotland. The Scotch Secretary to be created by this Bill is to be the responsible Minister for affairs connected with local government—such as public health, the relief of the poor, the care of lunatics, the supervision of prisons, and like subjects, none of which have fundamental differences, either in their principles or applications, from similar subjects of English administration. But if separation of Scotch and English administration be desirable, I do not in the least understand why it should suddenly stop so as to exclude the new Minister from all control over matters relating to law and justice. Questions relating to law and justice are the very subjects of all others in Scotland where there are national differences and even mysterious peculiarities. I could understand the demand for a Minister who should be intrusted with the important differences of legal procedure, a different law, and a different form of justice. But just at this point the Bill fails, and the English Secretary of State at the Home Office is to control such administration with the aid of the Lord Advocate. The Lord Advocate, who has hitherto been the Scotch Minister, is to have no official relations to the new Scotch Secretary, but is to be a sort of comet revolving in a small orbit, controlled by the great English luminary in Whitehall. The noble Marquess at the head of the Government, in speaking of the Bill in "another place," stated that he supported it because it was a work of decentralization, and that it was better to localize than to centralize administration. I could understand this argument if there were a Scotch Parliament to whom this new Minister was responsible; I could understand it in a lesser degree if the Office of the new Minister was to be in Edinburgh. But we have been distinctly told that this Office is to be in London. How decentralization and localization are to be produced by going from one side of Whitehall to the other side of Whitehall is altogether beyond my comprehension. The creation of this new Minister is an act of centralization, not of decentralization. It gathers into one office Acts now administered by the Home Office, the Privy Council, Treasury, and the English Local Government Board. Decentralization is the last word that can be applied to the Bill; but nationalization would be more appropriate. It practically means that no English Minister must presume to administer Scotch affairs. How would the converse proposition suit the ambition of Scotland—that no Scotchman should become an English Minister? One proposition is as good as the other. The new Scotch Secretary, as he is to have no charge of law and justice, must have something added to the duties of supervising local government, so that he may have an office of dignity and an office of work of such apparent magnitude as will justify Parliament in creating a new Minister. The dignity is to be conferred by giving to him the custody of the Great Seal. I do not know much about the Great Seal. I see that it has an office in Edinburgh, which is open one hour daily, and that it must be difficult to keep, for it has already a "deputy keeper" and a "substitute keeper." If such officers are really required for its safe custody, the new Scotch Secretary can have little work added to his office by being made Keeper of the Great Seal, and official dignity in these days does not arise from a mere name, but only from the due performance of official work and duties. As this dignity does not give work, education is to be added to his office. This raises the important question whether the supervision of education in Scotland by the new Minister is to be undertaken in the interests of education or in the interests of the new office? The Earl of Fife, speaking "elsewhere," let the cat out of the bag when he said that every Scotchman to whom he spoke on the subject, replied—"What on earth is the use of a Scotch Secretary if education is not included in his functions?" That really, Sir, is at the root of the Bill. Law and justice have been cut out of his functions, and so little is left for the new Minister to do that you must add something, and so education is to be joined to the Great Seal, to police, prisons, public health, lunacy, adulteration of food and drugs, pauperism, fisheries, wild birds protection, and other miscellaneous subjects with which education has nothing in common. No one will dispute that to Scotland education is a subject of the deepest interest, for its prosperity largely depends upon it. It is, therefore, a very serious matter to deal with education as a means of augmenting the importance of an office. In any case that is not an educational argument, for it proceeds on the assumption that education is a branch of administration which can be handed from one office to another, not for its own advantage, but for that of the office which takes it. No doubt, the noble Earl (the Earl of Rosebery) who introduced this Bill sincerely believes that the junction of education with the office of Secretary will benefit not only the office, but also education itself. I know much less of local administration in Scotland than that noble Earl; but I have made the study of its education a specialty, so I hope the House will allow me to state my reasons for opposing the educational provisions of this Bill. It is really the essence of the Bill, and cannot be relegated to the Committee stage. Afterwards I will speak of certain peculiarities in Scotch education. But now the initial question arises—Has education in Scotland suffered by its connection with that of England since the Act of 1872? For the answer to this question is the justification or condemnation of this Bill. Sir, it has gone on by leaps and bounds since it has been managed by the Department in Whitehall. Every parish has now its school board. In 1872 the schools in Scotland could only accommodate 282,000 scholars; now they have places for 656,000. The education, as a whole, has advanced, not only in extent, but also in quality. There is, therefore, no *à priori* argument for a change such as is proposed by this Bill. If we look at the amount spent on the education of the people in the three sections of the Kingdom, Scotland receives more than England. Taking the population of the Census in 1881, the money spent last year per head of the people was 2*s*. 6½*d*. for England, 2*s*. 8*d*. for Scotland, and 3*s*. for Ireland. If England had received as much as Scotland, the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have had to provide £162,340 more for English education. Surely, it is absurd to speak of neglect of Scotch education by an English Department with such figures. The House cannot forget that it has appointed various Select Committees during the last 15 years to consider how Ministerial responsibility can best be secured for the largely increasing Votes for Education. It was pointed out by all these Committees that the present system by which the Lord President of the Committee of Council on Education sits in the House of Lords is essentially bad in theory, though it is tempered in practice by the really active Educational Minister—the Vice President of the Council—sitting in the House of Commons. Another Committee sat last year under the Presidency of the late Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers), and it unanimously recommended that a Minister with duties not less important than a Secretary of State—by which they intended to indicate that he should be of Cabinet rank—should have charge of the education of Great Britain. The present practice of having the responsible Minister in the House of Lords, and the active, though irresponsible, Minister in the House of Commons, was emphatically condemned. The Cabinet of the late Government accepted the conclusions of this Report. The late Prime Minister (Mr. Gladstone), on the 6th of November, 1884, said, in answer to a Question—

> "We propose on an early day—I cannot name the day exactly—to adopt measures founded upon the Report of the Select Committee."—(3 *Hansard*, [293] 1116.)

This answer was understood to mean that a responsible Minister of Education for Great Britain would be appointed, not certainly that the present Vice President of the Council should be reduced in influence and position by being confined to England, while a Minister was to be created for Scotland, with Poor Law, police, public health, and other offices tagged on to his educational duties. I am sure that the late Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers) will not say that this is the spirit in which his Committee reported. But this Bill, so far as regards education, is founded on the system which has been so repeatedly condemned. It proposes that a Vice President of the Council for Education in Scotland shall be appointed, and the terms of the clause are copied from the Act for appointing the present Vice President of the Council of Education. The Scotch Minister is to be the Vice President of the Council in all matters regarding Scotch education. What will follow in law, fact, and practice? The present Vice President of the Council, whom we have been accustomed to look upon as the Education Minister *de facto*, if not *de jure*, is to be shorn of his proportions and dignity in order to give increased proportions and dignity to the new Scotch Minister. If this Bill becomes law, you will have two Vice Presidents of Education—one for England and one for Scotland—two subordinate Tycoons to administer education; while the powerful but invisible Mikado, the Lord President of the Council, sits up aloft in regions to which we have no access, and remains irresponsible to us who have to vote large sums for the education of the people, while we have no Minister of responsibility in the House of the people. There is no mistake in this subject. The Duke of Richmond, when President of the Council, was asked—"Are you or the Vice President the Minister of Education?" And he replied, frankly and truly—"I am the Minister of Education." All the Presidents of Council examined before the Committee accepted this responsibility, and gave to the Vice President the position of an Under Secretary of State. But we found on examination that the Vice President did all the work, while the President monopolized all the patronage. This false relation of Ministerial responsibility became intolerable to the House, and your Committee recommended that a distinct Minister of Education, with the position, if not with the name, of a Secretary of State, should be appointed. This is not a view confined to one side of the House. The late Duke of Marlborough, when Lord President of the Council under the Earl of Beaconsfield's Government, introduced a Bill to create a new Secretary of State who should take charge of national education. But what does this Bill do? It reduces the rank and position of the *de facto* Minister of Education in this House by passing part of his duties to the new Scotch Secretary, and thus it raises the power and position of the Lord President as the true Minister of Education, although necessarily, from his relations to the Queen, he is in the House of Lords, which has no touch with the education of the people. I have no doubt that the promoters of this Bill thought that they were really passing Scotch education to the Scotch Secretary. They have done nothing of the kind. It is true that the Earl of Rosebery, who had charge of the Bill in "another place," said that it transferred education to the new Minister "in the most complete and absolute fashion." But how did the Lord President view the alleged transfer? He said—

> "The Department existed, everything was ready to his hand, and the new official would merely have to take the place at present held by the Vice President of the Council for England, who was also Vice President of the Council for Scotland."

That is the law and fact of the change proposed by this Bill. Both Vice Presidents will continue to be subordinate to the Lord President, who has the ultimate and single responsibility for the education of Great Britain. The Lord President will continue to exercise the patronage of the Department, and will appoint the Inspectors and other officers for both England and Scotland. The Lord President has the right and the responsibility of approving or disapproving of every act of his subordinate Vice Presidents in both countries. I believe that this will be the working of the Bill; and I admit that if there be no removal of the Scotch Department from its present offices, the educational evil will be reduced, because the Lord President and the two Vice Presidents can meet in constant consultation. But we ought to be assured that this is the way in which the system will be worked without transference to a new office, and that the new Scotch Vice President of the Council created by the Act is, like the English Vice President, a responsible officer of one division of the Education Department under a common head, and with the advantages attending a common office of administration. But even this least injurious form of working the two Departments does not commend itself to men of large experience in educational administration. The present Government have wisely called into their councils a well-known Scotchman—Sir Francis Sandford—and given him a seat in the Scotch Education Department. No one in the Kingdom can speak with greater authority on the subject. He was asked by the Select Committee what he thought of a proposal such as is made by this Bill—

> "Would you be sorry to see the Vice President limited to English work, and somebody else introduced for Scotch work—say a Scotch Vice President ?—I think it would be better not to do so. My opinion is that it is better for the two countries to be both under one head."

It would have been better for education and easier for administration if the Bill had proceeded on the recommendations of the Select Committee, and made an effective Scotch Department with a separate Secretary, and gave to the new Scotch Minister an *ex officio* seat on the Board. To make him a subordinate officer of the Lord President is altogether a mistake of administration when you are creating a new Minister, while it increases the evils of a condemned system of educational responsibility, and puts formidable obstacles to the future creation of a true Ministry of Education. At all events, it prejudges the question before this House has had time to consider the Report of its Select Committee. One of the great reasons for recommending such a Ministry was that we felt sure the responsible Minister of Education would be a man of Cabinet rank, and naturally would sit in this House. The absence of a Representative of education from this House led to the appointment of the present Vice President, who, if this Bill passes, will be reduced to a Vice President for English education only. But with regard to Scotch education, there is neither security, nor even probability, that the new Minister will be in the House of the people. The 3rd clause says that "the Secretary, if not a Member of the House of Lords," shall be able to sit in the House of Commons. You will continue to have the Lord Advocate in this House, and the most natural consideration to a Prime Minister forming a Government will be to say—as there is a Scotch Minister already in the House of Commons, let us put the new Scotch Secretary into the House of Lords. Quite natural and quite proper such an arrangement, if he were not also the Education Minister for Scotland; but not convenient or even tolerable to this House, which votes £500,000 yearly to education in Scotland, to have no Minister here immediately responsible for its administration, when all results relating to the education of the people are so eagerly and constantly discussed in this House, and so rarely in the House of Lords. Is it not obvious that English education under an English Minister wholly devoted to it would have our fostering care; while Scotch education, lifted above our heads into the House of Lords, in charge of a Minister with fifty other functions, would be viewed with suspicious jealousy? Scotland has marked peculiarities in paying for higher subjects, and they are recognized in the Act of 1872; but when you find among these that classical and modern languages, as well as science, are subjects in primary schools, how are they to fare with a Scotch Secretary in the House of Lords? If you have any doubt on this subject, the recent discussion in "another place" by Lord Norton, and the speech of Viscount Cranbrook on the inexpediency of having such subjects taught in primary schools or in secondary schools by school boards, will indicate a very considerable danger. If the Scotch Minister was in this House, with the aid of Scotch Members this danger would be mitigated. It is possible, therefore, that the Prime Minister, in forming a Government, may ultimately allow the Scotch Minister to sit in this House. If so, we would then have three Ministers responsible for Scotch Business—not one Minister, which would appear to be the object of this Bill. First, law and justice would be managed by the Home Secretary, aided by the Lord Advocate. Then, sitting on the same Bench, but with an inferior salary of £2,000, you would find a Scotch Secretary, who has no official relation to either of them. Perhaps in time the English Members might learn their different responsibilities, and ask the right Questions of the right Ministers; but does not the whole arrangement look absurd, when it might be rectified in the construction of a Bill? My own belief is that no such bungling proposal as this Bill could have been made to us if it were not intended that the Scotch Secretary should sit in the House of Lords, and that the Lord Advocate should represent him in the House of Commons. But when his main work is to administer the £500,000 voted for the education of the people, both this House and the Scotch people will ultimately insist that he should sit in the House of Commons, which takes such keen interest in all questions relating to education. We have an instance of combined work in the case of the Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant. He practically controls the work of local government, law and justice, and education in Ireland, or, at least, he represents Ministerial responsibility in this House. But his fractional care of education is so limited in amount that we have constantly to be reminded that he has charge of Irish education. And what has been the outcome of this fragmentary attention to the absorbing subject of education? It is that though Ireland has had a National system for more than half a century, the last Census shows us that 41 per cent of the population above five years of age cannot read and write; while in one Province—Connaught—53 per cent are in this sad condition of ignorance. Had there been one Minister of Education for the United Kingdom, this melancholy outcome of half a century could not possibly have happened. And yet in "another place" this isolation of Irish education, and the neglect of it by a Minister who could only give to it a fragmentary attention, was quoted as a precedent, and held up as an example for the isolation of Scotch education. It was abandoned in the House of Lords; but the hon. Member for Roxburgh (Mr. Elliot) has given Notice of an Amendment to complete the isolation of Scotch education. It is true that in Ireland the isolation is so complete that teachers' certificates from that country are not recognized in England. Such a result is likely to happen if Scotland obtains the isolation of her education, for what interest would England have to recognize certificates given on a separate system? Already there is a plethora of teachers in Scotland; but it is relieved by 50 or 60 teachers, now the offspring of a common system, being annually appointed to English schools. The Earl of Rosebery, speaking in "another place," looks with contempt upon the proposal to have a Minister of Education for Great Britain, excluding Ireland, and calls him a vulgar fraction of a two-thirds Minister. But what will this new Scotch Secretary be when he sits in this House? As a Scotch Minister with an inferior salary sitting on the same Bench with the Home Secretary, and the Lord Advocate having the important control of law and justice, he will, indeed, be a vulgar fraction of a one-third Scotch Minister. But what will he be as an Education Minister? The Act of 1872—the Education Act—is to be pitched, with more than 50 other Acts, into his Office. As Scotch Secretary, he is already the vulgar fraction of a one-third Scotch Minister; but, as Education Minister, he is one of lesser dimensions still—a one-fiftieth Education Minister. For if there be a real work for him to do in the care of police, paupers, lunatics, fisheries, and wild birds, there can only be a small fragment of his time left to take care of education. We have been told that there is a consuming desire of the Scotch people to have a Scotch Secretary, and there is no doubt a widespread demand for it. But I do not admit that there is the same feeling for including education in his functions. A number of the small towns, through their Town Councils, have petitioned in favour of this inclusion; and the large towns of Edinburgh and Paisley have also done so. But the other large towns of Scotland have expressed no such desire. The Churches met in General Assembly last May, and the United Presbyterian Church has petitioned; but the Church of Scotland and the Free Church have not. The Convention of Royal Burghs expressed a unanimous feeling on the subject last year; but this year the Resolution to petition was only carried by a majority of 2. I do not believe that any feeling in favour of education being attached to his Office would have arisen had not the lawyers been able to cut out law and justice from it. It is because they have succeeded in doing so that education has been thrown to him as a *corpus vile.* Schoolmasters and Professors are not as powerful as lawyers in this House; but surely their voice should be heard in such an important proposal. Educational authority is certainly against it. The Scotch Educational Institute, which is composed of Scotch teachers, have petitioned in favour of one Minister of Education for Great Britain, and against the separation of

English from Scotch education. Out of 2,473 teachers who have expressed themselves by Resolutions on this subject, only 97, or less than 5 per cent, are in favour of the educational part of this Bill. The Scotch Universities, which are most intimately connected with the schools of the people, are represented in this House by two Members, both of whom are in opposition to this proposal. No doubt it will be contended that my own opposition to it has lost me my seat. I sit here with only a small majority; and it is quite true that a considerable number of United Presbyterian ministers who have always supported me withdrew their support. Whatever capital the supporters of the Bill make out of this fact, they cannot deny the sincerity of my convictions when I sacrificed a University seat which I have had the honour to hold for 17 years, in order that I might be free to oppose this Bill. Not a single teacher, Professor, or University authority has intimated to me their disapproval of my hostility; while a large number of them have encouraged me in opposing a measure which they think will be disastrous to the interests of education in Scotland. The Earl of Rosebery in "another place" stated that he had waited for the expression of the school boards. What has been that expression? There are 980 school boards, and of these only 36 have petitioned this House in favour of the Bill. They are all small boards, for the united population represented by them is only 80,000. The Edinburgh School Board was last year against the proposal; this year it is in its favour; but I do not find a Petition sent to this House. Of the large towns, the school boards of Glasgow, Govan, Dundee, and Aberdeen are against the transference of education. I include Aberdeen on the authority of its Chairman, who has been here to oppose the Bill. I do not deny that there is a general feeling in Scotland that the Education Department has not sufficiently distinguished the differences between English and Scotch education. It was to insure this that the Select Committee of last year recommended that there should be a permanent Scotch Secretary to the Department, so that the responsible Education Minister should be brought into touch with the peculiarities of Scotch education. These differences are real, and depend upon the fact that while education in England become National by the Act of 1870, the Scotch Act of 1872 was not the creation of a National system, but the extension of one which was no longer sufficient for the wants of the people. In Scotland the division between primary and secondary schools is not so marked as in England. The Scotch school boards are charged with the management of the burgh or grammar schools, and in England the boards have no such functions. This denominational system is not nearly so marked in Scotland as in England, for each parish has its school board. The Universities also receive many students direct from primary schools, where they obtain a certain amount of secondary education. These are distinctions of such importance that the Select Committee wisely recommended a responsible Scotch Secretary in the Education Department, with a staff charged with the ordinary administration of Scotch work. But, at the same time, they recommended that there should be only one responsible Minister for Education in Great Britain. England may learn many things from Scotch education, and the separation will be injurious to the interests of education in this country. For example, it will accentuate the antagonism between board and voluntary schools. You have an example in Scotland of board schools dealing satisfactorily with religious education, so that voluntary schools work with them in little antagonism. The denominations have had perfect confidence that the Department in Whitehall would give them fair play. But the Roman Catholics in Glasgow, who are very numerous, have not the same faith in a Scotch Secretary, who will be more subject to pressure from local influences. This has been pressed upon me as a real danger by those interested in denominational schools; and if it be well founded it will disturb the harmony which now exists between board and voluntary schools. If England may benefit by an example of this harmony, there is much also that Scotch education may learn from England. At present the Scotch Code is inferior to the English Code in its requirements, and requires assimilation. In the attention given to Art and Science, both in primary and secondary schools, Scotland is getting far behind England. Scotland has not yet adapted itself to the needs of a scientific age. It may be contended that if there had been a Scotch Minister these differences would have been rectified. But he will be the Representative of national prejudices which have hitherto prevented this progress in Art and Science, and a more complete isolation will confirm them, while the friction with the English system was gradually rubbing them down. The Science and Art Department in South Kensington will in future be presided over by the English Vice President, though in a few years every school in Scotland will be reported upon for drawing by an Inspector from that Department, and, I hope, before long, for science also. Does this not show the absurdity of the proposed separation? I need not say that I think the educational part of this Bill is essentially bad. It is bad, because it lessens the influence of the Vice President of the Council, who has hitherto been a *de facto* Minister of Education in this House, though under a system of defective responsibility. It is bad, because it will render it very difficult, if not impossible, for us to rectify in the future a system so often condemned, and will prevent us, if the House so desire, from securing a single responsible Education Minister, not only for primary education, but also for all the Votes for higher education, including Science and Art. It is bad for Scotland, because it gives to its education only the fragmentary attention of a Minister who has many other duties unconnected with education. This is now a Government measure, acquired, like the Estimates and various other Bills, as an inheritance. Its conduct in "another place" shows that it has only a stepmother's love. How was it that the Duke of Richmond, with his large experience in the Education Department, said not one word in its favour, although he was in the House? He literally, not metaphorically, turned his back upon the speakers all through the debate. How is it that the present Lord President (Viscount Cranbrook) was deaf to all persuasions, and refused to praise the Bill? I go further, and ask whether there is one of the leading statesmen on the Treasury Bench who like this Bill in their hearts? The Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross), in 1883, described the then proposed Scotch Secretary "as an independent officer, who would be neither fish, flesh, nor fowl." What does he think of him now with more than 50 miscellaneous Acts thrown into a Scotch Office, and then supplied with a Chair in the Education Department to administer the Education Act, when he has some fragment of time to attend to it? No doubt the Government may retort that this Scotch Secretary was the offspring of the Liberal Government. That is quite true. It was introduced into this House in August, 1883, by the late Home Secretary in a mocking speech that nearly strangled the infant at its birth. But then education was not in the Bill. I believe that now the right hon. Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) is a supporter of the Bill in its present form. A General Election is near. That induces both sides to throw a tub to the Scotch whale. There is a demand on the part of many persons in Scotland for a Scotch Secretary. Though I am one of those who do not see any advantage to my country in such a measure, I would not divide the House against giving to the new Minister all Home Office work and local government. If he had the control of law and justice, he would have functions which would give him dignity and insure him respect. But I do not like this Bill, which makes a Minister of shreds and patches, and then to raise him from an inferior position gives him a Chair to sit in an Education Department outside his Office, and in subordination to another Minister. It is quite right that he should have influence of a powerful character in a distinct administrative Scotch Education Department. That could be given him by making him an *ex officio* member of it. Such a course would not raise a barrier between Parliament and the important reforms required in the re-organization of education in this country. This House must soon give its close attention to this subject, and ought not on a side issue to preclude itself from its consideration. The great countries in Europe give education to the charge of a Minister dealing with that alone. The smaller countries, like Greece, Portugal, Egypt, and Japan, have done so. Even Victoria and New Zealand have now their Education Minister. But Scotland alone, which above all other countries is essentially educational, is in future to have a Minister made up of a large variety of heterogeneous materials mixed up like a Scotch haggis, and then salted with education to give it a flavour. It is too serious to deal with education in this fashion, and I make as earnest a protest as I can against it by moving the Resolution of which I have given Notice.

MR. J. A. CAMPBELL, in seconding the Amendment, observed that though he agreed with the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman, he could not commit himself to all the views he had expressed so forcibly and eloquently with regard to the Bill as a whole. At the same time, he could not say that he was particularly enamoured of this proposal to create a Scotch Secretary. He could not say that he had ever seen the necessity for adopting this particular way of improving the administration of Public Business connected with Scotland. For his part, he should have been better pleased if a Bill had been brought in to strengthen the position of the Lord Advocate, and, at the same time, to make an appointment which was proposed some years ago by the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross)—that of an Under Secretary of the Home Office, with special charge of Scotch Business. But the point in this Bill to which he would refer was that on which his right hon. Friend (Sir Lyon Playfair) had dilated so fully and so much to the instruction of the House—the proposal as regarded education. The question suggested itself—why was it proposed to transfer education to the new official? Was it in the interest of the new Office, or in the interest of education? It could not be said to be in the interest of the new Office, for the simple reason that when the Bill was introduced last Session it was not proposed to make this transfer. What, then, had happened to Scotch education during the past year that had made it necessary to transfer it to the Scotch Secretary? The advocates of the Bill in its present form had said that education would be the most important of all the matters with which the Scotch Secretary would have to deal; but in his opinion that made it worse for the Government of last year, for it convicted them of having proposed to create an officer without enough to do, or with nothing to do of sufficient importance. Then, as to the interests of education, he considered that education in Scotland would be best attended to by a Minister who was appointed to his Office with the view of giving his services to education entirely. That surely was a reasonable view, because his attention would not be distracted by other and multifarious duties. It was said by the advocates of this Bill that Scotch education could only occupy part of the time of a Minister of Education, and that, considering the relative proportions of the two countries, it could only have a small part of his time. Taking the Government grant as an index, they found that in England as much as £3,000,000 a-year was spent in education grants, and in Scotland £500,000; so that Scotch education might be said to represent one-seventh part of the educational interest of Great Britain, as measured in that way; and it was argued, therefore, that a Minister of Education could only be expected to give a proportion—say one-seventh—of his time and attention to the interests of Scotland. But even if that were true, a small proportion given by a Minister who devoted the remainder of his time to cognate subjects was much more likely to do justice to Scotch education than a much larger share of time given by another Minister, who had besides to attend to the miscellaneous and wholly unrelated subjects found in the Schedule of this Bill. But he did not allow that the attention given by the Minister of Education to the educational interests of the two countries would be given in a measure proportioned to the relative magnitude of the countries, or the number of their schools. It was enough if the interests of each country would be fully considered and attended to, and by one who had the advantage of being familiar with what was going on in both countries. There was proof that good had come to both countries from having their educational system under one Head. They found, from the evidence of past Vice Presidents of the Council, that being in charge of Scotch education had been a help to them in the administration of English education; and they had evidence from teachers of the best standing that the education of Scotland had profited greatly by the familiarity they had—through their connection with the Education Department—with the progress of education in England. While he felt strongly that any proposal to transfer education from the Education Department was to be deprecated, he felt no less strongly that it was necessary to plead for the separate management of Scotch education under one Minister. At present they did not enjoy this arrangement to the extent that was necessary, now that the educational work of the country had become so important and so extensive. The Committee to which his right hon. Friend had referred recommended that a distinct permanent Secretary should be appointed for Scotland, responsible to the Minister of Education. That was necessary, because in Scotland they had a different Education Act, a different Code, and different educational history and traditions from England, and they had even now, as they had had all along, a separate Scotch Education Department of the Privy Council. Now, it was necessary that they should have separate administration within the Ministry of Education; but that by no means implied that their system should not be under the same Minister as the English system. He thought that the want of this separate administration accounted for no small proportion of the movement for the transference of Scotch education to a Scotch Minister. He could not admit that the movement was general. It had been keen in some quarters; but those quarters were not numerous or very extensive. But grant separate administration under the Education Minister, and he believed that many of those who had petitioned for the transfer would feel that they had got all that they asked for. He might mention that some of the largest school boards in Scotland had taken up a decided position against the proposed transfer. In fact, the Petitions in favour of it were from boards and places which taken together did not represent a population equal to the population of one parish that had petitioned against the proposal. The Bill appeared to him to weaken the position of the Vice President. He would no longer be responsible for education in both England and Scotland. They would be placed further than at present from having a proper Ministry of Education, and they would be practically condemning in advance a Report which had not yet been considered. It had been said that the evidence taken before the Committee was that only of Presidents, Vice Presidents, and other officials, and the Report was disparaged on that account; but he would remind the House that the duty of that Committee was to consider how Ministerial responsibility, under which the Votes for Education, Science, and Art were administered, might be best secured; and the question could be best answered by consulting those who had been engaged in the actual administration. He hoped the Government would give some indication that the changes suggested in the Amendments of his right hon. Friend would be satisfactory to them; in which case, he hoped the House would not go to a division, and that the object his right hon. Friend had in view, and which he believed would substantially accomplish all that the Government and the promoters of the Bill desired—giving the Secretary for Scotland an interest in education, without giving him the place now occupied by the Vice President—might be attained. He begged to second the Resolution.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That," to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "in view of the Report of a Select Committee of last Session, recommending that there should be one responsible Minister of Education for Great Britain, it is not expedient, before this House has considered that Report, to proceed with the proposal of this Bill, that the charge of Scotch education should be removed from the Vice President of the Council, thus lessening his influence and responsibility, in order to transfer it to the Secretary for Scotland intended to be created by this Bill,"—(*Sir Lyon Playfair*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

MR. RAMSAY said, he was very sorry that this discussion should have come on so late in the Session, for the majority of the Scotch Members had left for their homes, believing that this Bill would not pass. [*Cries of* "No!" *and* "Hear, hear!"] Well, he believed that till Friday last it was not thought by anyone that they could expect to have an opportunity for discussion; and as the Bill might be amended, and would require to be reconsidered in the Lords, and then come back to this House, therefore it was thought and believed it would not pass. His right hon. Friend

(Sir Lyon Playfair) had given them the benefit of his views on this subject; but he recollected that his right hon. Friend made the same appeal to the House some six or eight years ago, when speaking in favour of appointing a Minister of Education for the whole of the United Kingdom. The object of the Committee, to which reference had been made, was a very definite one. The Committee was appointed to consider how the Ministerial responsibility under which the Votes for Education, Science, and Art were administered might be best secured. His right hon. Friend (Sir Lyon Playfair) attached great importance to that inquiry by the Committee; but they did not come to any resolution regarding Ireland. They only heard one witness regarding Ireland, and they felt that sufficient to satisfy them that the Minister for Education whom they desired to appoint should not take any cognizance of Irish education, but that Irish education should be left as it was. He was surprised to hear the right hon. Gentleman say that over the whole of Ireland 41 per cent of the people were unable to read or write; and yet to find that the Committee, with that fact before them, should have neglected to make any suggestion for the improvement of education in that country. The right hon. Gentleman spoke of one county in Ireland where there were 55 per cent in that condition; and he dwelt on that fact as an evidence of the little that had been done under the present system of Irish education. That was quite true; but a Committee appointed to consider how Ministerial responsibility could be best secured might surely, when they recommended the union of the education of Great Britain under one Minister, have taken some means of considering the difference in the systems of education in the two countries; but the Committee made no such inquiry, and made no suggestion for improvement either in Ireland or Great Britain. The English and Scotch systems were essentially different, and for that reason it was desirable that they should be separately administered. In England at present the majority of the schools were denominational. To place England on the same footing as Scotland it would be necessary to establish in the former 13,000 more school boards; and any Minister who had charge of that number of English boards would have enough to do without interfering with Scotch education. The right hon. Gentleman (Sir Lyon Playfair), speaking very sharply as to the prospects of Scotch education, had assumed that it had not suffered by the present method of administration; but how could he be sure of that? He had advanced in support of that idea the fact that the Scotch school children had earned 2*d.* per head more than the English from the Government grant; but that was to be accounted for, in his opinion, by the circumstance that Scotland had had a system of National education in operation for 400 years; whereas there had been no attempt at anything of the kind in England until within the last 15 years. It was significant that in the Committee presided over by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers) there was hardly a question asked as to the effect which any change in the mode of administration might have on Scotch education. It seemed to have been taken for granted that Scotland would be able to take care of itself. His right hon. Friend had expressed a doubt whether there was more than a limited number of persons desirous to have matters of education placed under a Secretary for Scotland. He did not like to controvert anything which was said by his right hon. Friend, who was so highly and justly esteemed in Scotland; but he must point out that the right hon. Gentleman had himself mentioned as his reason for withdrawing from his own country the zeal of his Scotch constituents to have Scotch education affairs placed under a Scotch Minister. He was as sensible as his right hon. Friend of the advantage that would arise if the Minister having charge of Scotch education had a seat in the Cabinet. He remembered that when, at the request of his Colleagues, he presented the first Memorial in favour of Scotch affairs, including education, being placed under a Scotch Minister distinct from the Home Secretary and the Lord Advocate, the Prime Minister asked him if it was wished that the proposed Minister for Scotland should be in the Cabinet. He (Mr. Ramsay) replied—"Certainly, that is our wish; but we do not make it a condition." The Memorial which he presented on that occasion was signed by more than two-thirds of the entire Scotch representation. A great meeting was held in Edinburgh nearly two years ago, such as he had never seen in his country at any time before; and it was then urged that every part of purely Scotch Business should be intrusted to the Minister who would be appointed if their wish were carried out. If his right hon. Friend (Sir Lyon Playfair) had been present at that great meeting he would never have entertained any doubt as to the feeling of the people of Scotland on that question. The people of Scotland were not only anxious to have this reform, but they were determined to have it; and although the Scotch Members did not act together so harmoniously as the Irish Representatives below the Gangway, they were not incapable of being educated in that policy of united action which their Irish Friends had found so successful. His right hon. Friend alluded also to the number of schools which had been established in Scotland since the passing of the Education Act of 1872, and adduced that as evidence of the efficiency of the administration of Scotch education in England; but the right hon. Gentleman had forgotten that the schools he referred to were not established by the Education Department, but, in terms of the Education Act, by the Board of Education from their office in Edinburgh. He adduced also the fact of the existence of the Scotch Education Department; but the truth was that the Department—and nobody knew better than his right hon. Friend—was but a sham. It had no record of proceedings, and it went on day by day without being asked for its opinion upon any question. He believed that the late Vice President (Mr. Mundella) did occasionally call some of the members of the Department to confer with him on certain points; but even then it was more a *pro formâ* meeting than anything like one for actual deliberate business, and that their opinion was never asked about the Code, or anything affecting it. He (Mr. Ramsay) felt, therefore, that it was quite sufficient to say that the people of Scotland were anxious to obtain this small measure of Home Rule. His right hon. Friend deprecated the separation of England and Scotland. He joined with his right hon. Friend in the statement that Scotland had derived much advantage from her union with England; but England had also derived much advantage from her union with Scotland. It was said that the education of England was very much the same as that of Scotland; but where in England did they find the labourer's son rising to fill a pulpit? They had nothing of the kind. Where in England did they find the shepherd's son getting to be one of the most learned men of his time? These, he thought, were evidences of the efficiency of their system. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman who was in charge of the Bill would be prepared to accept some of the Amendments on the Paper for the purpose of rendering the transfer of Scotch education efficient and complete, and thus adding dignity to the Office of the Secretary for Scotland.

Mr. COCHRAN-PATRICK said, he was somewhat surprised that his right hon. Friend (Sir Lyon Playfair) dealt with the general aspect of the Bill, as there was nothing in his Amendment to lead the House to believe he would attack the principle of the measure. He thought the Bill was one which was absolutely necessary; and he believed it was a Bill which would give very great satisfaction to the people of Scotland. He believed the main reason why the agitation in support of the measure assumed an acute form was that for many Sessions, for many Parliaments he might say, they had seen Scottish measures passed over, and not taken up, because there was no motive power to bring them forward; and he was sure, if the Bill should have the good fortune to pass into law, the result would fully answer the expectations formed of it. He was bound to say, with regard to the educational aspect of the Bill, he entirely agreed with his right hon. Friend. He was perfectly satisfied the real solution of the educational question was a Minister of Education, fully qualified and competent to deal with the subject. If they considered how important that subject was at the present moment, and how much more important it was likely to become in future, and if they considered also the vast amount of money annually involved in the Education Vote, he thought it was absolutely necessary that they should have one competent and responsible Head in that House to answer for that expenditure. But, at the same time, and along with a Minister of Education, he thought it was absolutely necessary that they should have the Scotch and English Departments in London made separate; that they should have a permanent Secretary for the Scotch Department; and that they should also have a Committee either of the Privy Council or of Privy Councillors. The measure before them was certainly not one in which the question of a Minister of Education for the United Kingdom could be dealt with; but he felt with his right hon. Friend that if they did anything in this Bill which would preclude or even postpone the adoption of such a measure, which he, for one, believed to be necessary—and it would come, eventually, sooner or later—that it would be a very great misfortune. But it should be remembered that a special recommendation of the Committee which had been alluded to was for a separation of the two Departments, and that that separation they could have now, and also have a Committee of Privy Councillors. He thought, therefore, it would be very advantageous if the Government would agree to the Amendment of his right hon. Friend to delete the words which referred to the particular position of the Scotch Secretary, and make him a Member of that Committee of Council dealing with Scotch education, leaving it to that Committee to place him in any position they pleased. Then he thought they should secure at once the great advantage of having a separate Department, and they would not imperil or put off the chance of the question of a Minister of Education.

Sir EDWARD COLEBROOKE said, he had always held the opinion that the demand which was contained in this Bill had its origin in the defects as to Scotch work in that House rather than from any defects in the practical administration of the country. He would deprecate anything like a separation of Scotland from England in matters of general administration. He believed their administration would be benefited if some Minister connected with Scotland were appointed who would stand beside the Lord Advocate and fight their battles. Public opinion in Scotland on the question of education was very much divided. The other day he had the honour of introducing a deputation from one of the largest parishes in Scotland, and their opinion was very decidedly against the proposition in the Bill. There was nothing conflicting between the two systems of education in England and Scotland, and they could be well worked together. He wished the present arrangement to continue; and he would strongly impress on the Government that they should do nothing to shake that union which now existed in the administration of the two countries. He hoped the House would soon get into Committee on the Bill.

Sir JOHN HAY, while not supporting the whole of the proposition of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair), entirely concurred in the views he expressed on the question of education; but he (Sir John Hay) thought that was a question which ought rather to be considered in Committee, and not at the present stage of the Bill. He confessed that although the Bill was one which might be considered to be more sentimental than businesslike, yet it was one which had the approbation of the people of Scotland. On the other hand, the general feeling of Scotland, so far as he was able to gauge it, was in favour of leaving the management of education under the Privy Council as at present conducted, with a special Department for Scotland under its control. He did not believe that there was any general desire in Scotland that the Secretary for Scotland should appropriate to himself, in addition to all the various odds and ends which were to be concentrated in that Office, the charge of the education of the country. After all, what was the reason why this Secretary for Scotland Bill had become a national desire? From 1707 to 1747 there was a Secretary for Scotland. From 1747 to about 1866 the Lord Advocate did the duty, and did it admirably; but about that time it was found necessary that the Lord Advocate should become Queen's Counsel in England, and have added to his various duties here as Scotch Minister the duty of attending to the trials in the House of Lords and elsewhere. The result of that was that from the time of Duncan Forbes to the time of James Moncrieff there was no complaint whatever of the management of Scotch Business in the House of Commons by the Lord Advocate under the Home Office; but from that time onwards there had been a general complaint, not due, he must say, to the negligence of the Lord

Advocate entirely, but due to the fact that there had been a great pressure of Business in the House of Commons, which had resulted in a difficulty to get through Scotch Business as well as other Business in the way the country desired. The fact had been that the Lord Advocate for the last 20 years had not been in the position of the Lord Advocate before that—he had not been the Scotch Minister to whom Scotchmen looked for the conduct of Scotch Business. His right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Edinburgh was right in saying that the general wish of Scotland was that education should not be among the matters entrusted to the new Secretary. That should be continued under the Privy Council with a special Secretary, and that he believed would be satisfactory to the whole of Scotland. That he believed would conduce to the advantage of education in Scotland, and, at the same time, to the management of the Scotch Business in that House, which would be expedited as far as might be possible by the creation of an official which, after all, was not an office of great importance, but was one which, under the Home Office, would no doubt gather up the various threads, exclusive of education, which were included in the Schedule of the Bill. He trusted his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Edinburgh would not divide the House on his Resolution. If he succeeded in excluding education in Committee he (Sir John Hay) should be happy to support him. He trusted he would not delay the Bill, which he (Sir John Hay) would rather see pass as it stood than not pass at all.

Mr. J. B. BALFOUR: I do not propose to go through the numerous matters that have been touched upon by previous speakers, but merely to say a very few words with regard to the question which has been raised by my right hon. Friend the Member for the Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrews (Sir Lyon Playfair)—namely, the question of education. I daresay an opportunity will be afforded at subsequent stages of the Bill for dealing with the other matters which have been introduced. I shall make my words very brief, in order not to stand between the House and its desire to get through the Bill. As a Member of the Government which introduced this Bill, I think it right to say that nothing has been urged to-night which has in the least shaken my opinion as to the propriety of confiding the care of education to the Secretary whose Office is proposed to be created by this Bill. My right hon. Friend (Sir Lyon Playfair) began his speech by making observations of a general kind relating to the scope and effect of the Bill, and then gave it as his opinion that the effect of introducing education into the Bill would operate disastrously upon the interests of education in Scotland. While I followed him with close attention, I failed to discover in what particulars this proposed transfer would have these disastrous effects; and I think there were some admissions, and indeed assertions, which my right hon. Friend made which go very far indeed to justify the introduction of education as part of this measure. He admitted that the present system was not satisfactory; and one of his earlier remarks by way of criticism of the Bill was that it was founded upon a condemned system. He did not say, as I understood, that what the Bill proposes was worse than what now exists; but he suggested that it was not so good as something which was promised, but had not yet been fulfilled. The standard of comparison which he set up was not so much between the present system, which he condemned, and the new proposal, as between the latter and the system which we might have if the recommendation for a Minister of Education were carried out. We have not got that yet; and there are many difficulties which stand in the way of the appointment of a general Minister of Education. I agree with my hon. Friend (Mr. Cochran-Patrick) that, even if this Bill became law, it would be open to Parliament in its wisdom at any future time to reconsider this question; and if it arrived at the conclusion that it would be well to have a Minister of Education, education could be detached from the Office of the Secretary for Scotland and handed over to a Minister of Education. I am not anticipating that. I am only saying this—that the passing of this Bill with education in it will not be a barrier to the creation of a general Minister of Education, if, in the judgment of Parliament and of the country, such creation should be thought desirable. Just let us see how very narrow, after all, the differences are between what my right hon. Friend (Sir Lyon Playfair) put forward as desirable and what is proposed in the Bill. I think it is now common ground that there should be a certain amount of separation between the administration of English and Scottish education. That is one of the very things which this Bill proposes to further. Again, it is agreed that there should be two Committees of the Privy Council. This Bill accepts that position, and proposes to make the existing Scottish Committee of the Privy Council a more effectual instrument for educational purposes than it is at present. These are two things in regard to which not only the arguments advanced to-night, but the recommendations of the Committee presided over by my right hon. Friend the late Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Childers) were practically agreed. I understand that the substance of the proposal of that Committee was that there should be a general Minister of Education, with an English Department, presided over by one Vice President, and a Scottish Committee presided over by another Vice President. There you have all the elements which you have here, except the common head over the two. So that if the House will consider for a moment how very slender the difference is they will see that there is no reason for rejecting this proposal, unless some cause can be shown for perpetuating or stereotyping the two separate systems which, it is admitted, should be brought into existence under a common head. The hon. Member for the Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities (Mr. J. A. Campbell) began by stating correctly that in Scotland we have different Education Acts, a different Code, and different educational traditions. In this he was correct; but I should have thought that these premises would have led to the conclusion that there should be a separate administration. But, by some strange transition, the conclusion which he seemed to draw was that you should put one man to administer both Departments, or put two sets of men to administer them, with one more or less ornamental head over the two. When we have arrived at a time when there are separate Acts, separate history, separate conditions, it seems the most natural thing in the world, when the Minister is being created to have cognizance of many of the most important matters in Scotland, that this matter of education should be transferred to him. That is the proposal of the Bill. My right hon. Friend (Sir Lyon Playfair), in moving his Resolution, spoke of the progress which has been made in educational matters in Scotland. It has been great, and I hope it will continue to be great. But has that been due to a system of common administration? My right hon. Friend says "Yes, entirely." I do not agree with that at all. It was due, in the first instance, to the passing of the Education Act of 1872. Although it is quite true that every credit is due to the Department in Whitehall, a Board sat in Edinburgh for a considerable time, and aided in starting the administration of that Act. It was the great Act of 1872 which adapted the parish schools of John Knox to the existing conditions; but I submit that though the Act was launched and started with the aid of a temporary Board, it would not have succeeded any the less if it had been launched and started under a Scottish Secretary. While I should be sorry indeed to deny to the Department the credit justly due to it for the manner in which it has administered that Act, still I fail to see that the administration by the Department was the cause, or at all events the sole cause, of the admitted advance of education in Scotland. I do not say that it would have been altogether better, or that it would have been worse, if there had been a separate administration of that Act in Scotland. I believe, in some respects, it would have been better if there had been a more direct and close connection between the official —whoever he was—and Scotland, if there had been more immediate and direct access to him; and if he had had his undivided attention devoted to Scottish education I do not see how that could have given a worse result. But it is said that, in some way, the advantages of deriving light from what is going on in English educational matters will be lost by this change. Why should that be? I do not suppose, if this Bill passes, and education is assigned to the new Minister, he will shut his eyes to what the English Department is doing. I hope he will keep his eyes and his ears open to everything that is passing. Of course, he would not be influenced by that, except in so far as his reason dictated. He would not be obliged to assent to what he did not think right; but if he saw anything which he thought was an improvement, he would adopt it because it was an improvement. Is it not possible that there may be a certain advantage in an honourable emulation between the English and Scotch in educational matters? I should think it is very probable that if you have one Minister administering English, and another Minister administering Scottish education, they will each desire to do their best, and each wish to show that his educational system is superior to the other. The possibility of a Minister of Education being appointed at some future time is no reason against this measure of reform being passed now. We know that, under existing conditions, we cannot get Acts passed as we desire them; and if we are not to go a practicable step in a certain direction because there is a possibility of a larger proposal coming up for consideration by Parliament, there might be an almost indefinite postponement of many reforms. Something has been said in regard to Scottish opinion; and, no doubt, as we have heard this evening, there is a division of opinion in Scotland on this subject. But, as far as I have been able to collect it—and I have taken a good deal of pains to do so — the preponderance of Scottish opinion is in favour of the inclusion of education in the Bill. Of course, if this question goes to a division, we shall have an opportunity of learning the sentiments of those who represent Scottish opinion in this House. I do not desire to detain the House longer. I thought it right to make these observations, in order to show that I see no cause whatever to go back on the Resolution in pursuance of which this Bill was introduced with education in it.

THE LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. DALRYMPLE) said, he was anxious to say a few words on this Bill, for more reasons than one. Before he gave those reasons, the House would, perhaps, allow him to say that, so far as he understood, there was no difference of opinion in the House on the point of including education in the Bill. The only question was as to the degree in which education should be included in the Bill. His right hon. and learned Friend (Mr. J. B. Balfour) had referred to the Board of Education in Edinburgh, which existed first in 1872, and which did so much to put the Education Act into operation. He (Mr. Dalrymple) maintained that the fact that that Board was provisional, and not continued, was a proof that it had been intended that in future the Act should be worked from Whitehall. He desired, before he forgot it, to refer to a remark made by the hon. Gentleman the Member for Falkirk (Mr. Ramsay) concerning the great feeling shown in Edinburgh two years ago upon the question of education. The hon. Gentleman referred to the meeting which was held in Edinburgh at that time. It was, however, a peculiar circumstance, but one worth mentioning, that at that great meeting the question of education was not referred to.

MR. RAMSAY: I supported a Resolution myself in reference to education and all distinctively Scottish Business.

MR. DALRYMPLE: Then I stand corrected.

MR. RAMSAY: It was not mentioned at the deputation.

MR. DALRYMPLE said, he did not think any very great stress was laid upon the question at the meeting, and for a very good reason. The two first resolutions at that famous meeting were moved by two noblemen whom he would designate as Lords A and B—[*Cries of* "Name!"]—well, Lords Aberdeen and Balfour of Burleigh—and they differed entirely in regard to the question of putting education under the Secretary for Scotland. It was not likely, therefore, that the question of education was mentioned very much at the meeting. But he would pass on—he had only mentioned that to show that the reference of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Ramsay) was a type of the language which was used in regard to this subject. Reference had been made to the enthusiasm for this measure, and the enthusiasm was interpreted as enthusiasm for the educational proposals of the Bill. There was enthusiasm about the measure, but there was no enthusiasm about the educational proposals of the Bill, because there was no unanimity upon those proposals. He had said that for more reasons than one he was anxious to say a few words on this Bill. He did not agree altogether with the educational proposals in the Bill; and, furthermore, two years ago he led the opposition to the Bill for the establishment of a Local Government Board in Scotland. He held then, and he held now, that the Bill had not then been properly thought out. It was thrown out in "another place," and he believed no one ever regretted its loss. By the fate of that Bill time was given for public opinion to be matured upon the question; and even if he were disposed to resist this measure, which, indeed, he was not, he should admit that there had been in Scotland a great advance of opinion in favour of the measure. It was not too much to say that many people were possessed with the idea of having a Scotch Minister to manage their affairs. People might differ as to the title to be given to the new Minister; they might differ as to the subjects which were to be dealt with by the Minister; they might differ as to the expectations they entertained of the appointment; but there was no difference, so far as he knew, as to the appointment itself, and accordingly a very great interest was taken in this Bill. The truth was that their defect in Scotland, as was very well said some time ago by the noble Earl who took charge of the Bill in "another place" (the Earl of Rosebery), was not legislative, but executive. It was not legislative, because the Scotch Members were in the habit, generally speaking, of agreeing on measures relating to Scotland entirely without reference to the side of the House on which they sat; and even in a very congested Session of Parliament it was sometimes possible, in consequence of that agreement, to pass Bills relating to Scotland. The defect was executive. He did not wish to reflect in any degree upon the distinguished men who had filled the Office of Lord Advocate of Scotland; but the very circumstances which had led to this Bill had somewhat altered the position of that official. This movement had made the position of Lord Advocate somewhat provisional, so far as his lay character was concerned. Anyone who had seen the room at the Home Office in which the Lord Advocate sat would not doubt for a moment that his condition had of late years been of a provisional kind. It was a small and dark apartment, and he doubted if it was even wholesome. The room was typical of the way in which Scotchmen carried on their affairs throughout the world; they carried them on in spite of the most adverse circumstances. But let him say there was no reason why, if this Bill passed, the position of the Lord Advocate should not be enduring. The Lord Advocate would still be an officer of State for Scotland; he would have, as heretofore, a great deal of patronage in his hands; he would retain his connection with the Home Department in reference to the administration of law in Scotland, and he would be the Legal Adviser for Scotland. Reverting to the question of the feeling in Scotland in favour of the Bill, he might say that he had been at some pains to examine the Petitions which had been presented, because the language used about the Petitions had been so very wild. It had been said that the school boards were unanimously in favour of the proposed transfer of the control of education to the new Minister; but he doubted that that was so. There was a body known as the Convention of Royal Burghs in Scotland, and hon. Members were in the habit of attaching considerable importance to its opinions when its opinions were favourable to their view of any case. When, however, its opinions were contrary to those of hon. Members the Body was spoken of as of no importance. Last year that Body was apparently unanimous about putting education under the Secretary for Scotland; but this year it was so divided on the question that by a bare majority of two it saved itself from stultifying itself by reversing its former decision. Whatever enthusiasm had been shown in Scotland for the Bill it could not have reference to the educational part of the measure. The proposal about education as it stood in the Bill was never even in print in the House of Lords before it was introduced. To show how suddenly the educational proposal was made, he might say he remembered the Lord President of the Council saying that until he came down to the House of Lords he had never seen it. One other statement had been made—namely, that Scotland had made up its mind to have charge of its own education. No one was opposed to the Secretary for Scotland being identified with the management of education, the only question was as to the degree of that management. He rejoiced more than he could say that when Her Majesty's Government took up this Bill the subject of education was left an open one. There was great division of opinion about it; it was not an essential part of the Bill; but there was no sort of reason why the difference of opinion existing should in any way imperil the passing of the Bill. He had given the utmost thought not only to the whole Bill, but to this particular part of it; and he confessed that he cared more for the fate of Scottish education than he did for eking out a sufficient amount of work for the Secretary for Scotland. It was of more importance that the Scottish education of the future should be thoroughly well managed than that the Secretary for Scotland should have his time fully occupied; and yet he held that the Secretary for Scotland's time might be fully occupied even if he had no concern at all with education. Let the House remember that the proposal to include education was no part of the Bill of 1883, and no part of the Bill of 1884, and that in its present shape it was no part of the Bill of 1885 as introduced. ["Oh!"] He was not, and no one else was, proposing to put education out of the Bill; but he maintained that the particular form in which education was referred to in the Bill was no part of the Bill as the Bill was at first introduced; and, therefore, it was open to them in Committee to consider the exact shape in which education should be embodied. It was because he remembered that there had been some dissatisfaction in recent times with the management of Scotch education in detail that he considered it was important that the Scotch Committee of the Privy Council should be strengthened, and that its Members should receive the addition, amongst others, of so well-known a friend of Scottish education as Sir Francis Sandford. Now, he (Mr Dalrymple) submitted that instead of the Secretary for Scotland being a Vice President of the Council for Scotland he should be an *ex officio* Member of the Scottish Committee of the Privy Council, and that there should be a Secretary told off in the Department to be at the special call of the Scottish Committee, and that he should be specially informed, by being a Scotchman, of the needs of Scottish education. That was a proposal which a large school board in the West of Scotland, and a great many elsewhere in Scotland, were in favour of. They were not in favour of including education in the Bill, but they were in favour of such a connection as he had specified between the Secretary for Scotland and education; they did not want to supersede the present Vice President, whose equal he never could be, because the English Vice President was a Member of the Cabinet, and it was not contended that the Secretary for Scotland should be always in the Cabinet. He was all for recognizing the peculiarities of Scottish education; and his idea was that the management of Scottish education should be distinct, but not separate. It should be distinct, inasmuch as those charged with it should be the Scotch Committee, of which the Secretary for Scotland would be a Member; and who could doubt that that Minister would be put in the Chair in the absence of the Lord President? On the other hand, no encouragement should be given to the idea of separating the management of Scottish education from the management of English education within the Department. This was the only modification he had to suggest in regard to the educational proposals of the Bill. Its adoption would not only satisfy his right hon. Friend (Sir Lyon Playfair), who moved the Amendment to the Motion that the Speaker left the Chair; but it was approved by all the Members from Scotland who sat on the Ministerial side of the House; and Gentlemen who sat on the Opposition Benches, to whom he had had an opportunity of mentioning it from time to time, regarded it as a fair compromise. The recommendations of what was known as the Childers Committee were not before the House at the present time; but what he asked of hon. Members was that the recommendations of that Committee should not be prejudiced by anything they did now. He put it to the House whether this modified proposal as to the new Secretary being an *ex officio* Member of the Scotch Committee was not less calculated to prejudice the larger question hereafter than was the proposal to create the new Secretary a Vice President of the Council? While he sincerely desired to support the Bill as a whole, he should be very glad if the House, when it got into Committee, thought proper to accept this modified plan in reference to education, which he really believed would unite a great number of persons.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER: I assure the Scotch Members and the Committee generally that I will not detain them more than a very few minutes. I feel this is a Scottish question, and I would not have intervened at all except for my interest in education generally, and for the fact that I happened to be in Office when the English Bill was brought in, and when the Scotch Bill was brought in with great ability by the Lord Advocate of that time. It was my business to assist the right hon. and learned Gentleman in conducting the Bill, and to do my best afterwards in administering the Bill. This is a matter in which Scottish feeling and the views of Scottish Members ought to be mainly considered; and although I have a rather strong opinion in favour of the view of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrews (Sir Lyon Playfair) I do not know that I should have ventured to express it if the opinion of the Scottish Members was strongly the other way. But certainly it is quite clear, from the debate to-night, that there is a very considerable amount of Scottish support of my right hon. Friend. The real point in dispute is whether education in Scotland will suffer or not by Scottish education being put into the hands of a Minister perfectly distinct from the Minister having charge of education in England. I have not the slightest doubt that education in England will suffer by the change; but hon. Members will say—"That is your look out; we do not much care about that." Of course, I feel that we have gained a great deal in England by the example which Scotland has set us, and by the hints that we have received from Scotland, though the advantage is not altogether one-sided. The old system of education in Scotland was something that was quite wonderful in its time; it was an example not only to England, but to all Europe. But the social condition of Scotland has to some extent changed, and you have now very large populations in towns, as we have in England, and there was the fear that the children of the poor would be somewhat neglected by the old system of higher education for the peasants of the country. There is now a feeling that there are two perfectly different educational systems; and it is said—"Let us have a Scottish Department with a Scotchman at its head, and an English Department with an Englishman at its head." I think that as matters are worked at present Scotland gets far more than its share, and very rightly, in the management of the education of Great Britain. Take the facts. The late Permanent Secretary, Sir Francis Sandford, was a Scotchman with Scotch views which he never forgot. The present Permanent Secretary, my friend Mr. Cumin, is also a Scotchman; and you may be quite sure from that, that Scotchmen, knowing so much as they do about education, will have a very strong representation in the Education Department. But, after all, the real question is this—It is not proposed that there should be a Vice President for Scottish education, and that he should have nothing else to do —it is admitted that Scotland, with a population under 4,000,000, could hardly expect that there should be a special officer of State for that purpose, and that if there was he would be over-shadowed by the other officers of State who had more to do—but that the management of Scottish education should be entrusted to a Scottish Minister who has many other things to attend to. Is it likely that education would be attended to better by such a Minister than by a Vice President of Education who has nothing but education in Great Britain to attend to? Speaking with some degree of practical experience, I have not the slightest hesitation in saying that education in Scotland would gain more by the carrying on of the present system than by the change. Now, what you want is a Minister who has nothing else to do but to attend to education, and the difference between Scottish education and English education is nothing approaching the difference between education and the other matters that will have to be dealt with by a Scottish Minister. I have had some little experience in Ireland also. Of course there were circumstances in Ireland that took one's attention from everything else; but I was greatly interested in education, and I would have been delighted if I could have attended to it. General business prevented me giving that attention to educational matters which I should have liked to give. And what was the result? Why, that education in Ireland fell into the hands of a Board, and I fear that the result of the change now proposed will be that education in Scotland will fall into the hands of a Board. I have no doubt some hon. Members prefer that; but what is the meaning of it? The more the control of education fell into the hands of a Board, the more it fell out of the hands of the House of Commons, or out of the hands of the Representatives of the people. I would hardly venture to express my opinion upon the subject if educational authorities in Scotland were strongly on the other side; but, so far as I can make out, they are in favour of the view of my right hon. Friend (Sir Lyon Playfair). Now, the schoolmasters of Scotland are a remarkably intelligent body of men. They take an immense interest in their Profession, and rarely have I received so strong and earnest a deputation as the deputation of Scotch schoolmasters who waited upon me two or three weeks ago to protest against this Bill. They contended that if the Bill passed the cause of education in Scotland will suffer, and they were particularly alarmed at the idea of education getting into the hands of a Board, and out of the immediate cognizance of the House of Commons. Well, then, it is true that there have been some school boards petitioning in favour of the plan proposed by the Bill. But my right hon. Friend (Sir Lyon Playfair) tells me there are 980 school boards, so that there cannot be any very strong feeling in favour of the Bill, because only 36 school boards have petitioned for it, and these 36 only represent a population of 80,000. There are not two more important boards in the whole of Scotland than those of Glasgow and Govan. When I was down in Glasgow, I found that the education there was managed economically, with the greatest possible efficiency, with full respect to the Scottish feeling on higher education. I had the honour of opening a higher board school in Govan, a suburb which, as hon. Members know, has increased more rapidly than any part of the United Kingdom. The population of Govan has increased in 10 years from 50,000 to 110,000, and with this large increase the school board has kept pace, not only in the matter of mere elementary teaching, but with higher teaching. I venture to state that there is more feeling in the two boards of Glasgow and Govan against this Bill than there is in the 36 boards which have petitioned in favour of the measure. There is also the large town of Dundee. That takes the same line, and I am told that in Aberdeen there is a greater feeling against the Bill than for it. My hon. Friend the Member for Aberdeen (Mr. Webster) is one of the best authorities on education in the United Kingdom, and I hope I do not anticipate him when I say he agrees with my right hon. Friend (Sir Lyon Playfair). I think we ought to know what the view of the Government is. My hon. Friend the Member for Buteshire (Mr. Dalrymple) made a very good speech; but, so far as I could make out, he is in favour of the view of my right hon. Friend (Sir Lyon Playfair) on the question of education. Did he speak on behalf of the Government or not? Surely we ought to know that. The question of education is one of immense importance to Scotland. Whether you make this change or not, it does seem to me to be rather a strong measure to propose it on a Bill brought in in the very last days of a Parliament. It appears to me that if the Government are rather unfavourable to it, it ought to be left for the decision of the Scotch people in the Election which will soon take place. I thank the House for the patience with which they have listened to me.

Mr. MUNDELLA: I must apologize to hon. Members from Scotland for taking any part in this debate; but during the last two years this subject has been so constantly before me, and I have received so many deputations and representations on this question, that it is only fair to those who have been at so much pains to bring their views before me that I should state what those views are, and how they bear on Scottish education. I had hoped to have risen after I had learned the views of my right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope). It is significant he is not in his place at this time to give us the views of the Government upon this subject. I am sure he must have some views on the question, and I have very little doubt what those views are. Now, by this Bill it is proposed to transfer the management of Scottish education to the new Secretary for Scotland. I would not venture for a moment to dispute the right of the Scottish people to have a Secretary for Scotland, or to administer Scottish education in Scotland. If a Minister were appointed to manage Scottish education solely and exclusively, I do not think anyone in this House would have any right to complain. I have no doubt that if a Minister devoted his whole time to the work he would do it well; but I am quite satisfied that to make such an appointment would be a comparatively reactionary step. It must be borne in mind that this is not the Bill which was introduced in the House of Lords. The Bill now stands in the most anomalous shape, reducing, as it does, the position of the new Secretary, with respect to education, to an absurdity. The new Secretary would have to deal with 50 or 60 Acts of Parliament; he would have to administer the Cattle Diseases Acts; he would have Home Office, Local Government Board, and other Scotch work to attend to; and he would not be, as it was intended he should be, the sole administrator of the Education Department in Scotland. He would simply be the Vice President for the Education Department of Scotland under the English Lord President, and the English Lord President will sit in the Privy Council Office, and the Scottish Minister will sit, I suppose, in the Home Office. The whole of the patronage of the Scotch Education Department will be vested in the English Lord President, and there is not a single act the new Secretary can do that may not be vetoed at any moment by the English Lord President. I cannot conceive anything more anomalous or more absurd than the position in which the Bill stands at the present moment. Talk about a step in advance! It is many steps backwards. It is not a step in the direction in which we have been going; but it is a decidedly reactionary step, and one which I believe will be fraught with disaster to education in Scotland. My right hon. and learned Friend the late Lord Advocate (Mr. J. B. Balfour) was very adroit in taking advantage of a statement made by my right hon. Friend the Member for the Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrew's (Sir Lyon Playfair) to the effect that the present system is not altogether satisfactory. It is quite true that the present system is not altogether satisfactory; but why is that so? If my right hon. and learned Friend (Mr. J. B. Balfour) refers to the Report of the Committee, he will see that the present system is not satisfactory, because we have no responsible Minister for Education. What are you doing by this Bill? You are making confusion worse confounded; you are making a Vice President who is not to administer in his own Office his own Department, but who must go to another Office, under the Lord President, where he will have to ask for whatever staff he may require, and will have to submit all his Minutes, schemes, and Codes to the Lord President's approval. Now, with respect to the present administration. My right hon. Friend (Mr. W. E. Forster) has spoken in the most eulogistic terms of Sir Francis Sandford. Sir Francis Sandford has been the Secretary for Scotland as well as for England ever since the passing of the Act of 1872; and I may say, from five years' association with him, that, as Secretary for Scotland and for England, he did his duty faithfully and well. The Scotch part of his work he did with affection, and, so far from Scotland having been neglected under Sir Francis Sandford's administration, it always had his first thoughts and best efforts. Scotland has not suffered under the present administration. If she has suffered, it has been owing to the agitation of the last two years. All educationalists in Scotland—all those who have administered education and care about its progress, are thoroughly opposed to putting education under a Scottish Secretary. I am speaking from what I actually know. I have met the educationalists in Scotland, and have found a singular unanimity in this respect. There are two Members for the four Universities in Scotland, and both of them have spoken against the educational proposals of the Bill, and six out of the eight Scotch Members who have spoken in this debate have declared against these proposals. My right hon. Friend the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) referred to the great school boards of Glasgow and Govan as being opposed to the inclusion of education in the Bill. He might have added

Dundee and Perth and Aberdeen. All the great communities in Scotland are in favour of the Bill, but against the inclusion of education. One of the hon. Members for Glasgow is in favour of it, but the other is against it; and I may say that Mr. George Anderson, than whom Scotland never had a better Representative on educational matters, besought me to oppose as strongly as I could the transfer of Scottish education to a Scottish Secretary. I will not detain the House long; but just let me point out that which has been referred to by various other Members—namely, what will be the position of this much-occupied Scotch Secretary. Will he be able to deal with Scotch education when he is Vice President of the Scotch Council of Education? No; he will have nothing to do with any part of Scotch education except the literary department. Will he be a Minister representing the Science and Art Department—will he have anything to do with the teaching of Art in the common schools of Scotland, or of Science in the new endowed schools of Scotland? What would he have to do with Institutions like the Highland Institution and the Heriot's Trust? Why, nothing at all. You will have one Minister to settle the literary part of the Code, and another Minister to settle the Science and Art teaching, and also that more important branch, technical education, which Scotland cannot much longer neglect. Then take, for instance, the circulating objects for teaching Science. They will come from the English Vice President, who has to deal with the Science and Art Department—who has the supply of the Museums in his charge—all this must come from the English Vice President, and the Scotch Vice President will have nothing to do with it. So that the Code will have to be framed by the Scotch Vice President and submitted to the English Vice President entirely as a literary Code, and the Science and Art question will have to be dealt with by the English Vice President. Can anything be more confusing or more absurd than the position to which this matter has been brought? The Vice President of the Council at this moment is the sole Minister who devotes his whole time and attention to education. He receives Reports from time to time from the various Ministers of Education throughout the world. It is his business to acquaint himself with all that happens in regard to education, not only in this, but in other countries. He is brought daily into contact with the Inspectors, managers, teachers, and the various educational systems that are in vogue and in progress. It is his business to gather up all points that his opportunities and experience suggest to him, and endeavour to apply them successfully to the educational system he has to administer, and, that he may be free to do this, Parliament has relieved him of all his other duties. It was thought a great anomaly that a Minister of Education should represent the Privy Council, and should have to do with questions of cattle disease, and so on. Unhappily, business of this kind has been put on him; and what would be said hereafter of the administration of Scotch education, if the gentleman intrusted with it had to discharge all these duties? Let me point out the first duty that would devolve upon the Scotch Minister of Education. His first duty would be to revise the Code. The Scotch Code needs revision. It should have been revised before, and it would have been but for this agitation. No one would revise it while this agitation, which had for its object to transfer the work from one Minister to another, was going on. I should like to see the Code revised by any new Vice President, and I should like to see what sort of condition the new Minister would be in after he had been six months in Office. I think we can very well imagine what would be the result. If he is not himself complete master of his business, what will be his position? Why, he will be entirely at the mercy of his permanent officials. I do not dispute that he may have good permanent officials; but a Minister of Education who resigns himself solely to his permanent officials, and is content to be governed entirely from within-side of his own Office, will inevitably come to grief, and we should soon hear about it in Scotland. That sort of system would not do at all. Scotland would lose the advantage, then, of the large experience of the Minister whose sole object it is to deal with education. She would lose another great advantage—namely, she would lose the advantage of interchange of ideas. I will give you an example of what I mean. A few months ago, either at the beginning of this year or at the end of last year, I invited some Scotch Inspectors to come and inspect English schools with English Inspectors, and see what they found in them which struck them as being good or bad, and to report on them. They found much that was very interesting to them, some things that were very new, some things that they admitted were complete revelations to them; and I say to Scotch Members, honouring them as I do, and the educational system they have given to their country in the past, that there is one side of Scotch education which requires waking up and improvement. Instead of teaching Greek in their public schools to boys who are going out to work, they should teach them some modern languages and modern science, and bring home more to the pupils the facts that are necessary to enable them to apply the Arts and Sciences to the industries they have to enter upon. There will be no great advantage resulting from interference with the present system in regard to the training of teachers. The Scotch Secretary will have to train his own teachers entirely to meet his own supply and demand, and the English Minister will have to train his. Now, at the present time, a considerable number of Scotch teachers come to England, and I should be glad to see more of our English teachers go to Scotland to get the training that is to be acquired in that country. It would be a very good thing for them to do so; and it is, therefore, desirable that there should be solidarity in the system between the two countries so far as the training of the teachers is concerned, so that it should not be said that Scotland produces too many teachers and England too few. If you divide the two systems, the result will be that the English Minister will train just as many teachers as he requires for his own schools, and the Scotch Minister will train just as many as he requires for his, and it will be impossible to have that interchange and solidarity which there should be. I do not know whether hon. and right hon. Gentlemen opposite have read the Memorials which have been received upon this subject. There has been one from teachers, not elementary teachers, but teachers of all ranks in Scotland. There is no better class of teachers in Europe than the Scotch teachers of to-day. They are every day coming more and more into the Universities—more than half the teachers, I think, have passed through the Universities—and so far from the Scottish education having deteriorated, and the teachers having had their position injured by the Act of 1872, I was assured the other day that, since the passing of that measure, Scottish education has vastly improved as compared with the old parochial system —that the Universities are exacting a higher test every year, and that the Scotch schools are meeting these tests. I believe, however, that if this proposal is carried out, Scottish education will not keep pace with the progress that it has made during these recent years.

MR. BUCHANAN said, he desired to say a few words, as the House would be under some misapprehension if it imagined that all the Scotch Members agreed with the sentiments which had been expressed by previous speakers. There was one sentiment, and almost one only, which he agreed with in the interesting speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair); and that was that this Bill, both this year and in previous years, had been singularly unfortunate in those who took charge of it in that House. He quite agreed with the right hon. Gentleman, and he thought that the hon. Gentleman the Member for Buteshire (Mr. Dalrymple) was justified in saying that they had an example before them in the attempt at infanticide made on the Bill at its first appearance by its first father, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt). And now they found that the Bill was in charge in that House of those who, two years ago, spoke against it and voted against it, and he thought he might say obstructed it in its progress through the House. The hon. Member for Buteshire had opposed it; but on the present occasion he had stood up in a white sheet, and with a candle in his hand, doing penance.

THE LORD OF THE TREASURY (Mr. DALRYMPLE): I beg the hon. Gentleman's pardon. I have done nothing of the kind.

MR. BUCHANAN said, that, at any rate, the hon. Member's vote that night would be singularly in opposition to the vote he had given and the speech he had delivered on the subject two years ago. Then the action and vote of the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) would be very different from his action and vote two years ago. He had said on that occasion that he was rather lukewarm towards this Bill; that he did not altogether care for it; in fact, that he rather disliked it; but that there was one argument in favour of it which had not been advanced—and it had not been advanced to-night by anyone sitting on the Ministerial Bench. The right hon. Gentleman said—

> "There was one argument in favour of the Bill which he had omitted to notice, and it was this. One defect of Scotchmen was that they did not show well at the poll; they had a habit of returning a majority of Liberal Members, and the result of that was that a Liberal Government could always command the services of eminent Scottish lawyers. It had not always been the case that the Conservative Government could do so, and that was a consideration the Conservatives should not lose sight of. This provision might be of convenience in the extremely unexpected event of a Conservative Government coming in. He did not mean to say that a Conservative Government were likely to come in; but in no circumstances, however unimportant, ought it to be lost sight of when they were passing legislation of this kind. Though he should vote with his hon. Friend against the Bill, still that was a reason which made him believe that, after all, there was something to be said for it."—(3 *Hansard*, [282] 1523.)

Now a Conservative Government had come in; but the Conservative Lord Advocate, unfortunately, had not a seat in the House. He (Mr. Buchanan), therefore, supposed that was the motive, and that was the sole reason, why hon. and right hon. Gentlemen on the Benches opposite now took up the sponsorship of this Bill. For what had been the action of those who had spoken more or less in favour of the Bill that night? Why, the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Universities of Glasgow and Aberdeen (Mr. J. A. Campbell) had spoken against the Bill and blocked it on a previous occasion, the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for the Wigtown Burghs (Sir John Hay) had spoken against it and blocked it, the hon. Member for Buteshire (Mr. Dalrymple) had spoken against it, blocked it, and divided against it. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross) had also spoken against it, he did not know how often. He had spoken against it on the second reading; he had advocated Amendments, and had blocked it on going into Committee—had blocked it with the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) and the hon. Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar). Those were the Gentlemen who now had charge of this unfortunate Bill. The form to which the Government were going to reduce the Bill was exactly the form in which it was in in 1883, and that was what Scotch Members had to object to. His right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair) he entirely agreed with in the criticism he had made as to the alteration that had been made in the form of the Bill as it at present stood—as to the manner in which it proposed to confer the charge of education on the new Scotch Minister. His right hon. Friend had clearly shown the confusion that would arise in the Education Office from the presence of two Vice Presidents. But added to that was the alteration proposed by the Government opposite, and, he was sorry to say, supported by the hon. Member for North Ayrshire (Mr. Cochran-Patrick), who had hitherto been a thorough supporter of the Bill. That alteration was practically to take education out of the Bill altogether. It was right that the House should be informed that if they were going to do that the Bill would not be worth having, and would not be received or welcomed in Scotland. He should like to say one or two words as to the argument brought forward by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair). The right hon. Gentleman's argument as to the progress of education had, he thought, been answered several times over. The right hon. Gentleman's other arguments were, first of all, a comparison between the educational systems of Great Britain and Ireland, and then one which he had based on the evidence of Mr. Childers' Committee, and the state of public opinion in Scotland on the subject. With regard to the argument as to the condition of Irish education, he (Mr. Buchanan) did not think he need trouble the House with any reply; for the right hon. Gentleman would himself remember that he had advanced that argument in Committee to the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Border

Burghs (Mr. Trevelyan)—at that time Chief Secretary for Ireland. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Border Burghs would on no account allow that the backward state of Irish education was due to its being managed in Dublin under the direction of the Chief Secretary; and the right hon. Gentleman had compared the backward condition of that education in the past with its present state, and had pointed out the great progress it had made during recent years. Then, as to Mr. Childers' Committee, he thought that one point had not been noticed. They ought to consider what was the authority of that Committee in dealing with this question. It would be in the recollection of some Scotch Members that the Motion of the hon. Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock) for the appointment of a Minister of Education was brought forward on the same night as the Local Government Bill for Scotland was read a first time, and that at the conclusion of the discussion, after the Motion was put, there had been some allusion to this question of the control of Scotch education being dealt with by the Committee, when his hon. Friend the Member for the Falkirk Burghs (Mr. Ramsay) got up and protested against this Bill coming within the observation of the Select Committee. It had not been mentioned in the speech of the right hon. Gentleman who proposed the Committee, and the hon. Member (Mr. Ramsay) at once got up and said—

> "No arrangement would be satisfactory to the people of Scotland unless they had a Department of their own for administering the laws relating to education in Scotland."—(3 *Hansard*, [280] 973-4.)

But that was not all, because a week or two after, when the Local Government Board Bill came on for discussion, the hon. Member for the Kilmarnock Burghs (Mr. Dick-Peddie), whom he was sorry not to see in his place, moved to put education in the Bill, and he was met by the late Chancellor of the Exchequer, who said that this Select Committee had been appointed, and was going to deal with it. What was the reply of the hon. Member for the Kilmarnock Burghs? Why, that he could not recognize the action of the Committee on that subject, for the matter had not been referred to the Committee, and that the only Scotch Members put upon it were the Members for the Universities of Edinburgh and Glasgow, whose views were known on the subject, and who, it was known, would vote in the same direction. A further *caveat* had been entered against it, for on the 17th of August, 1883, he himself (Mr. Buchanan) had said that the

> "Select Committee appointed was not such as would adequately enable a thorough investigation to be made, and a satisfactory decision to be given."—(3 *Hansard*, [283] 1032.)

He was bound to say that they could not have supposed that these two hon. Gentlemen, when they took up the matter, would have proceeded to deliberate upon it in the manner they did. They actually did not call a single Scotch witness on the subject. The only persons examined were the Permanent Secretaries of the Department, both Scotchmen certainly (Sir Francis Sandford and Mr. P. Cumin), and two Gentlemen from Ireland, the others being either past Presidents or past Vice Presidents of the Council. No one single witness was called from Scotland; and were they, he would ask them, to be bound by that Committee, when they knew that they did not attempt to get any evidence which did not agree with their own view? Therefore, he did not think that Committee was entitled to very much attention on this subject. Then there was the question of Scotch feeling on the subject. Well, he must, first of all, protest against the argument of the hon. Member for Buteshire (Mr. Dalrymple) with regard to the Petitions which had been presented to that House on the subject. The hon. Member said that the people were not in favour of the transference of educational matters to the Scotch Secretary, although in favour of the Bill, because education was not in the original Bill. He would point out, however, that in the Bill of 1884 education was transferred to the proposed new Minister; and it was on the basis of that Bill, as approved by the House and as introduced this year by Lord Rosebery, that all these Petitions had been sent in. More than that, almost all the Petitions this year specially included a clause in their prayer that education should be given to the new Minister. He would point out also that there was not a single public Body in Scotland which had petitioned against education being placed in the hands and under the control of this new Minister. He had only one other thing to say with regard to Petitions. Mention had been made of School Board Petitions; but no one had mentioned the large numbers of Town Councils and other public Bodies who had petitioned in favour of this Bill. He had looked through the list, and he found that no less than 70 Town Councils and Municipal Bodies had petitioned this year in favour of it, and these included places of the importance and variety of Edinburgh, Greenock, Inverness, Paisley, Montrose, &c.; and he would also point out that he knew of no single instance in which one of those Bodies had said they were not in favour of the Bill including the question of education. Beyond this, he and other Scotch Members had had many representations made to him throughout the Session on the point. It was perfectly well known, and the Government ought to be aware of it, that this was the very substance of the Bill. The whole object of the measure was to give a thorough-going Department for Scotland, and there would be no general interest in it if it did not deal with the question in which all Scotland was interested in—namely, education. If Her Majesty's Government were going to accept the Amendment of his right hon. Friend, then they had better not go on with the Bill at all.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) said, the last speaker had said that the occupants of the Ministerial Bench had hitherto been very lukewarm in supporting this Bill. Well, he must remind the hon. Gentleman that the debates to which he referred had not taken place upon this Bill at all, but on the Bill of 1883, which was in no sense the same Bill as that which was now before the House. He was especially surprised by what had fallen from the hon. Member, because he had said that if education were omitted from the present Bill it would not be worth having. He even hinted that he and his Friends would obstruct it. Well, in the Bill of 1883 education was not included; and, therefore, according to his own contention, the Bill which they were lukewarm in supporting was one which, in his opinion, was worthless. The debate that evening had been chiefly confined to a question which he thought ought to be left to the Committee—namely, the precise position to be taken with regard to Scotch education. The right hon. Gentleman, who understood the matter, and who spoke first that night (Sir Lyon Playfair), had not confined his remarks merely to the question of education; but he had spoken against the Bill as a whole. The right hon. Gentleman had told them that their motive for bringing in the Bill was to be found chiefly in the fact that a General Election was approaching, and that but for that fact there would not be found that unanimity which existed amongst Scotch Members. Well, all he could say on that point was that some time ago, at a meeting in Edinburgh, he himself had spoken very strongly in favour of the measure, and he believed that a very large number of Scotch Members were committed to it long before the prospect of a General Election appeared above the horizon. The right hon. Gentleman who moved the Amendment said the tendency of the Bill would be to narrow Scotch national feeling and to separate the two countries. Well, if he believed that either of those disastrous effects were likely to follow in the path of this Bill he would certainly have nothing more to do with it; but he could not understand why the appointment of a Minister for Scotland, administering a Scotch Department not in Scotland, but from Whitehall, would have a tendency to promote provincial narrowness or to separate the two countries. Then the right hon. Gentleman said that the efficiency of official Business, especially with regard to education, would not be promoted by this measure, because it was evidently the idea to make the Minister for Scotland a Member of the other House. Well, he did not believe that there was the slightest idea of allocating the Minister for Scotland to one House more than to the other; nor did he believe that even if the Minister were in the House of Lords that circumstance would make him neglectful of the interests of education, as the right hon. Gentleman seemed to infer. Some hon. Gentlemen held that the Lord Advocate was the proper Minister on whom the additional weight of Scotch Business should be thrown; but, as he had pointed out years ago, there was not always a Lord Advocate in that House. It unfortunately happened, for instance, that when a Conservative Government came into power their Lord Advocate was not always elected, although they hoped that if they were returned at the coming General Election their Lord Advocate would be in the House. He thought that Scotland had a right to ask for a separate Minister, and, seeing the great difference between Scotch and English education, that education should be included in the Bill. The right hon. Gentleman had held that the tax upon the time of a Scotch Minister demanded by the consideration of several affairs would render him unable to devote the same amount of time that ought to be devoted to Scotch education; but he would point out that although the Scotch Minister with regard to Scotch education might have far more varied duties to perform than the English Minister of Education, still the demand on his time would probably be less than in the case of the English Minister. Indeed, he could not believe that there would be found any number of duties appertaining to this new Office which would so overburden the Minister that he would not be able to devote his best attention to the interests of a subject which was so dear to the hearts of his countrymen. He altogether denied that there was a single sentence in that Bill, or in the Bill as it was sought to be amended by the right hon. Gentleman, tending towards a separation of the interests of the two countries. He would be out of Order if he attempted to discuss that Amendment now, nor did he wish to do so; but he would suggest to the House that they should no longer delay the prospects of the Bill by debating a point which could be best discussed in Committee. He would suggest that they should get into Committee, and that when they came to the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman they should thoroughly thrash the matter out. He thought that the right hon. Gentleman would wish that the question of education should be discussed in Committee; and he would most earnestly recommend all Scotch Members who desired to see the Bill pass into law that Session not to interpose any unnecessary delay at this stage of the proceedings.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he wished, with the permission of the House, to make a few observations on this subject before the Question was put from the Chair, because he had been connected with this Bill from the commencement. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair) had made a very impartial attack all round in stating his objections to the Bill; he began by attacking everyone on the Front Benches, and, amongst other things, he had charged him (Sir William Harcourt) with having been guilty of something like infanticide with reference to the Bill. But the right hon. Gentleman should remember that before he could perform that operation he had brought it to birth, and that very early in 1880 he had come to the conclusion that it was desirable that there should be a separate administration of Scotch affairs. He remembered very well having consulted with the Earl of Rosebery on the subject in 1880; but the real difficulty had been to get an expression of Scotch opinion in favour of the measure, and then to discover what that opinion was. And when his right hon. Friend complained of his lukewarmness in this matter, he remembered that he had been so doused with cold water by Scotch Members both in and out of the House that it was not an easy thing to maintain the temperature at the point he wished. But for the last three years he had been endeavouring to discover what were the wishes of Scotch Members on this subject, and that, too, with a strong and earnest desire to carry them into effect. First of all, he introduced the Bill of 1883; and the right hon. Member for Montrose (Mr. Baxter), who had studied the subject for many years, said it was exactly the thing that the Scotch people wanted—the thing they had wanted all along—and that he was glad they had got it at last. Well, he naturally supposed that everything was right. But afterwards he discovered that it was the thing which nobody wanted; another proposal was made, and he was expected to be enthusiastic in favour of it. There were many hon. Gentlemen who did not like that Bill; and, amongst others, the right hon. Gentleman who had just spoken (Mr. A. J. Balfour) said he was opposed to the Bill of 1883 because it did not include education, although when the Bill was before them in 1883 he did not say one word on the subject of education. He did not think that that was the ground on which the hon. Member for Bute (Mr. Dalrymple) had opposed the Bill; but, as a matter of fact, the Bill had been cold-shouldered all round. However strong might be the feeling in Scotland—and he believed the people of Scotland did wish for the measure—an extraordinary conviction took possession of hon. Members on both sides of the House that they were not very favourable to it. Then took place the great meeting at Edinburgh, and a deputation followed to the Prime Minister, and he (Sir William Harcourt) remembered that it was said that they had expressly determined not to accept any Bill which did not include education. Now, that was distinctly the case at the beginning of 1884, and the late Government were blamed for not including education in the Bill of 1884. After trying to ascertain the opinion of the Scotch Peers, the late Government were extremely anxious to know what were the views of Scotch Members in the House of Commons. There had been great difficulty in discovering that, and he was bound to say that the present debate had not removed that difficulty. He could not make out that any two Members who had spoken that evening held exactly the same views upon this subject. He would like to know what were the views which Scotch Members entertained on this subject of education, because if they were clearly expressed he should be extremely glad to defer to them. For his own part, with his right hon. and learned Friend the late Lord Advocate, he was prepared to support the Bill as it was introduced into the House of Lords. That was his view upon the subject; but he did not pretend to have that absolute knowledge of the matter which many Members present possessed, nor had he the knowledge which the Earl of Rosebery necessarily had when he introduced the Bill into the other House of Parliament, although he had taken the best means he could to inform himself from persons best acquainted with the subject. If the question of education was to be discussed, he thought that the present debate should terminate as soon as possible.

Dr. CAMERON (who rose amid cries of "Divide!") said, it was all very well for the hon. Member opposite who cried "Divide!" to be impatient; but he did not represent a Scotch constituency, and it would be well for him to remember that possibly some other Scotch Members might have to speak upon this question. He should himself not have spoken on the question if he had not understood that the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Lyon Playfair) did not intend to divide the House upon his Amendment. He understood that the occupants of both the Front Benches would be governed by the opinions of the Scotch Members; and, therefore, he would have liked a division to take place, because he believed it would have shown that the proportion of Scotch Members who were opposed to this proposal to those who were in favour of it was as two to one. Without travelling over the old ground, he wished the House to understand that there was a large section of the Scotch people who, so far from agreeing with what the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella) had said—namely, that Scotch education had flourished under his Presidency, were convinced that it had flourished in despite of it. He wanted the right hon. Gentleman to understand that there was not the same unanimity of opinion upon that subject as he appeared to think. But the question was whether or not education in Scotland would be improved by the proposed changes. Well, his opinion was that it could not be made worse than it was at the present time. During the existence of the Scotch Board a number of grants were made for building purposes; but they were so administered that a deputation came up from Glasgow to point out that until they could get the grant for building on different lines to those laid down by the Department they had better build the schools themselves without any grant at all. With regard to the schools in the Highlands, year after year the Scotch Board had protested against the absurdities and extravagance of the Department in that matter. Further, he had put a Question to the late Lord Advocate on the subject of corrupt practices at elections, and the right hon. and learned Gentleman had told him that the law in England had made those corrupt practices illegal; but that with regard to Scotland nothing had been done, and the consequence was that the Scotch School Board Elections were carried out under an improper system. Again, what power had the

Vice President to carry out what he conceived to be good for Scotch Education? There had been, under a Scotch Education Act passed some years ago, a provision for the examination of the higher class schools in Scotland by Government Inspectors; and it was the intention that the Treasury should bear the expense of those examinations. But they had been pegging away at the Department for five or six years, and it was only the other day that they had succeeded in getting this reform carried through. They were told that the Scotch Code was inferior to the English Code. If that were so, why had not the right hon. Gentleman, who had been so long at the head of the Education Department, paid a little attention to Scotch affairs, and made the Scotch Code as good as the English? He mentioned those facts to show the absurdity of expecting that they would have greater powers in the hands of the Scotch Secretary if he had to attend to the affairs of the whole country. There was another important matter—namely, the health question, involved in this; and he could not help expressing his surprise that his right hon. Friend should pooh-pooh a Bill which would create a Minister for Health. He reminded the House that this Bill was the effect of a compromise, and that it was introduced into the House of Lords in a much stronger form. As he could not get the whole of what he would have liked, he went for a part; and he trusted the Government would adhere to the compromise that had been arrived at with regard to the Bill.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he would appeal to the House as to whether they had not discussed this matter long enough, considering that the whole question of education must be discussed again on the 5th clause? Under the circumstances, he thought they would do well to get the Speaker out of the Chair; and then, as he had no wish to keep hon. Members discussing the question unnecessarily, he proposed, after the 2nd clause had been passed, to move to report Progress, and they would then take the discussion on the education question on another day.

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR said, after the long discussion that had taken place, and the statement of the right hon. Gentleman that they would leave the question of education open, he thought it right to ask the House to allow him to withdraw his Amendment.

MR. MARJORIBANKS said, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) had stated that it was merely a question between the Vice President and the Chairman of the Council of Education. But he thought it was a question of restoring the Bill to the state it was in when the Earl of Rosebery introduced it to the House of Lords. He thought some further explanation was necessary; and he asked the Government whether they intended to accept the Amendment of the right hon. Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair), the Amendment of the hon. Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. Elliot), or that of the hon. Member for Fifeshire (Mr. Preston Bruce)?

MR. A. R. D. ELLIOT said, he should like to discuss this question sufficiently to enable the Government to state to the House what line they intended to take with regard to the Amendments on the Paper, as had been suggested by his hon. Friend who had just sat down. There had been an extraordinary difference in the language which proceeded from the Treasury Bench with regard to this matter. They had had a fancy sketch of what had taken place in the House of Lords. What occurred was that the Bill, as introduced into that House, more or less with the approval of the Government, was a Bill which transferred bodily the management of Scotch education from the Education Department to the new Secretary for Scotland. The Acts relating to education were scheduled in the Bill, and all the powers exercised by the Department were transferred bodily to the Secretary for Scotland; but in the passage through the House it was proposed to substitute a clause constituting the new Secretary President of the Committee of Council on Education. The Bill had gone through three distinct stages, and they had heard that night that the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair) had proposed actually to constitute the new Minister an *ex officio* Member of the Board. The Education

Board consisted of a number of persons who never came together. He was told that even on such occasions as when the Annual Code was brought forward they did not meet; that the Board had no head; and that, in fact, the whole business was in the hands of the President of the Council. He urged on the Government to tell the House what it was they proposed to do. He did not intend to address the House in the strong terms used by his hon. Friend the Member for Glasgow (Dr. Cameron); but if he were disposed to do so, he also could tell some tales about the management of matters by the Education Department. He had had some small experience in educational matters in the past; and he could only say that, instead of thinking that the Scotch parishes required to be made more alive to their duties, his own opinion was that the Education Department required to be awakened. In a particular case well known to the late Vice President of the Council, if it had not been for the action of persons of some little Parliamentary influence, who had used it on behalf of the education of the parish, the parish would have been entirely neglected by the Department, which it was difficult to get to perform even its statutory duties. Why that was the case he did not know; it might be because the Education Department had its hands full of English business, or because they thought that Scotch education was not a matter of first-rate importance. He had strong testimony from some school boards in Scotland that they were convinced by the neglect they had suffered that their endeavours would not be rewarded until their interests were looked after by a Minister for Scotland. He hoped that before the Speaker left the Chair they would be told by the Government what it was they intended to do when the House went into Committee.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): I understood that my right hon. Friend had stated that we intended to stand by the Bill as it is.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Main Question, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Short title) *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Appointment of a Secretary for Scotland).

On Motion of Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS, the following Amendment made:—Page 1, after line 9, to insert—

"There shall be paid to the Secretary, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, a salary of two thousand pounds a year."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) moved, in page 1, line 14, to leave out after "determine," to end of clause, and insert as a new paragraph—

"The salaries of such secretaries and other officers of the Secretary's office shall be fixed with the consent of the Treasury, and shall, together with such other expenses of the said officer as may from time to time be sanctioned by the Treasury, be paid out of moneys provided by Parliament."

MR. BUCHANAN asked if this clause would empower the Government to transfer the permanent staff of the Education Office, who had charge of Scottish educational work there, to the Scottish Secretary's Department?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): Yes; it would do so.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he thought it almost impossible for the Bill to go further that night. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would now consent to Progress being reported.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he did not wish to detain the Committee unnecessarily; but he would suggest that they should continue until Clause 5 was reached, when the real question at issue would arise.

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR said, he understood that there had been a distinct promise on the part of the Government that they would not go beyond Clause 2. In consequence of that understanding several hon. Members had left the House.

Committee report Progress; to sit again *To-morrow.*

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Holland.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Sir Henry Holland, Secretary to the Treasury.*)

Mr. SEXTON said, he did not rise to offer any opposition to the Motion of the hon. Baronet, but merely to state that he should reserve for the third reading of the Bill the special subject on which he had some remarks to make.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported*, without Amendment; to be read the third time upon *Wednesday.*

PUBLIC WORKS LOANS BILL.—[Bill 254.]

(*Sir Henry Holland, Mr. Dalrymple.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Sir Henry Holland, Secretary to the Treasury.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses *agreed to.*

New Clause—

"'The Harbours and Passing Tolls, &c. Act, 1861,' shall be construed as if the expression 'shipping purpose,' in sections two and three thereof, included the advance of money for the redemption of debts incurred by the authority of any harbour under any Act of Parliament for the improvement of such harbour."

Mr. STEVENSON said, he proposed to move that the clause be read a second time.

The CHAIRMAN: In my opinion, the proposed clause of the hon. Member is out of Order, inasmuch as it is beyond the scope of the Bill. This is a Bill for the purpose of enabling the Public Works Loans Commissioners to make advances for certain purposes up to a certain amount. The hon. Member proposes to include in it the provisions of another Bill, and that proposal is not in Order.

Mr. STEVENSON said, on previous occasions opportunity was taken to do a thing precisely similar to what he now proposed to do—namely, to enlarge the powers of the Public Works Loans Commissioners in regard to loans by Clauses in the Annual Bill. He wished to point out that in the Act of 1876 power was taken to advance money to a particular Railway Company beyond the then existing powers of the Commissioners. And he found also that in the Act of 1879 a clause was inserted empowering the Public Works Loans Commissioners to lend money to the Peabody Trustees, and to Companies engaged in the erection of labourers' dwellings. His present proposal was to enlarge the powers of the Public Works Loans Commissioners in the administration of the Harbours and Passing Tolls Act. He believed that in so doing he was not taking an unusual course.

The CHAIRMAN: I have not ruled the hon. Member out of Order without taking competent advice on the subject, and that advice is that the clause of the hon. Member is beyond the scope of the Bill.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that perhaps the Chairman would be good enough to define how this clause which the hon. Member proposed differed in respect of the precedent which the hon. Member had cited. In what particular did that Amendment differ from the Amendment made in 1876 and 1879? This was an extremely important matter, and it was desirable that the ruling on this subject which would become a precedent should state precisely why a very similar, if not identical, thing to that which was allowed to be done in 1876 and 1879 should now be ruled out of Order.

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Sir Henry Holland) said, that one of the matters mentioned was the Harbours and Passing Tolls Act. A certain amount of money had been invested in the Board for the purpose of carrying out that Act. In that Act the words "shipping purposes" were defined; but by this new clause it was now proposed to extend the words "shipping purposes;" to give them a further and wider definition; and thus to extend practically the power of the Board. This would be beyond the scope of the Bill, and should be effected by a Bill to amend the Harbours and Passing Tolls Act. The point aimed at by the proposed clause required consideration. However, for the present he ventured to suggest that this clause was really extending and enlarging the power mentioned in this very Bill, by which money was to be placed in the hands of the Commissioners for a special purpose.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is impossible for me to point out the difference between this question and those referred to by the hon. Gentleman, because these Bills, or the particulars of them, are not before me. I would point out that the clause the hon. Gentleman proposes to insert is on a different subject to the Bill now before the Committee.

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; to be read the third time *To-morrow.*

SEA FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT BILL [*Lords.*]—[BILL 250.]

(*Baron Henry De Worms.*)

COMMITTEE.

Committee *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

MR. MARJORIBANKS: May I ask when it is really intended to take this Bill? I have come down here to-day at great inconvenience, because I thought it was especially arranged that the measure should be taken to-night. I hope the Government will take it upon an early day, as it is obviously very inconvenient for hon. Members to be kept up here night after night expecting it to come on.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Baron HENRY DE WORMS): My intention was to take it to-day; but it was pointed out to me that it would be necessary to have the Amendments printed, as otherwise great confusion would be caused. I am, however, anxious that the Bill should be brought forward as early as possible. I would ask hon. Members not to burden the Paper with Amendments if they desire to see the Bill carried to a successful issue.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Are there any other Amendments on the Paper besides mine?

THE SECRETARY (Baron HENRY DE WORMS): Yes; there are other Amendments besides those of the hon. Member.

MR. WILLIAMSON: I think I may say that there will be no difficulty in disposing of mine.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

(*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland.*)

[BILL 68.] COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

Sir Henry Holland

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Short title) *agreed to.*

Leases of Land by Agreement and otherwise.

Clause 2 (Power of limited owner to make leases. 46 & 47 Vict. c. 60).

MR. SEXTON said, he desired to call attention, in line 10, to the words "the term of any lease shall not exceed 99 years." The period dealt only with the power of the Sanitary Authority to take compulsorily any lands referred to in the Provisional Order for any term of years not exceeding 99. He did not know whether the discretion of the limited owner should be restricted in this case, and why land should not be taken for more than 99 years if the parties thought fit.

THE CHAIRMAN: Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 14, to leave out—

"There shall be reserved thereby the best yearly rent which can reasonably be obtained, to be," and to insert, "the rent reserved thereby shall be."

MR. SEXTON: That is not my Amendment. I wish to move the Amendment in the name of Sir George Campbell.

Amendment proposed, in page 1, to leave out Sub-section (1).—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the sub-section stand part of the Clause."

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, that the reason why 99 years was fixed in the sub-section was because that was the usual term of building leases.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES): 99 years is according to the ordinary usage.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. SEXTON said, he now begged to move the following Amendment:—

Page 1, line 14, to leave out "there shall be reserved thereby the best yearly rent which can reasonably be obtained, to be," and insert "the rent reserved thereby shall be."

The words he proposed to strike out seemed to him to be altogether a new phrase, and he thought the words he suggested would be much better.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 14, to leave out "there shall be reserved thereby the best yearly rent which can reasonably be obtained, to be," and insert "the rent reserved thereby shall be."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, that those words were taken from the usual form, and he did not see why the Committee should depart from them. He would ask the Committee to adhere to the words of the clause as they stood.

MR. VILLIERS-STUART said, that speaking as an Irish landlord he had no objection whatever to the Amendment proposed.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, he had no objection to the Amendment if a corresponding alteration were made later on.

MR. SEXTON said, the landlord was perfectly certain to take care of his own interests; and he, therefore, did not see why his Amendment should not be accepted.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clause 3 (Confirmation of lease) *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Compulsory powers of taking land for a term of years).

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, the first section of this clause ran as follows:—

> "For the purposes of the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1883, the Local Government Board may, by provisional order confirming any scheme under that Act, empower a sanitary authority to take compulsorily any lands referred to in such order for any term of years, not exceeding ninety-nine years, at a rent to be determined in case of difference in the manner provided by this Act."

He wished to move to leave out the word "compulsorily," in line 8. He must say, in the first place, that the idea of the compulsory lease was an entirely novel idea, for in English law or any other law it was an entirely new idea. The power of taking land by purchase was given in the interests of the State, and they had very often to fight that power and to protest against it. There were many cases in which the landlords would be very glad indeed to give up their lands for the purposes of this Bill; and when the measure had been referred to the Committee last year, he, for one, had been very anxious to make the Act of 1883 work as smoothly as possible. Among other things he had considered was the expense that the Sanitary Body would be put to in the case of land being taken for labourers' cottages either compulsorily or otherwise. If the landlord had to give his land they eliminated a great protection—that was that the landlord had to prove his title, the expense of doing which was as great, although the piece of land in question might be two or three acres, as it would be to prove a full title to a whole estate. Therefore, the landlord to save expense, and to save friction, and to enable the limited owner to give a lease for a longer time than the power of settlement would allow, was enabled to give a lease for 99 years. He would not say it had not been proposed that the lease should be made compulsory, because he had understood that the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy) in his absence had stated that he hoped that a compulsory lease would be given; but the idea of a compulsory lease was one which had, practically, never entered into the minds of a large portion of the Committee. It was an entirely new idea. It had been maintained that it was perfectly clear that the Committee intended that this power of compulsory leasing should be giving, because the Land Commission would be brought in to adjust the rent. It appeared to him to be an extraordinary thing that a landlord should be obliged to give a compulsory lease of land for the purpose of labourers' cottages. He could understand compulsory sale; but he ventured to remind the Committee that compulsory leases were entirely contrary to the legislation of the present Government. They were bringing in Bills and making every possible arrangement to buy out the landlords, and now they proposed in this Bill to compel landlords to create tenants—squat tenants of half an acre of land for 99 years. It might come about that a landlord would sell his property to his tenants and go elsewhere. What would be the result then? Why, he would sell all his property except this small patch which they had compelled him to leave to the Sanitary Authority, who in their turn had leased it to the labourer, who in his turn would probably pay no rent at all for it, and who would certainly not keep it in a proper state of repair or cultivation. He had no idea that there was any notion of compulsory leasing until he took up the Bill and looked at it closely. There he saw the word "compulsorily;" but even then he could not really believe it, and thought it must be an error in the drafting of the measure. It involved an entirely new principle, and would work extreme harm. It was a very dangerous principle, and if they once entertained it they would never know when they were going to stop. If they introduced the principle for the purpose of enabling the building of labourers' cottages, there was no reason why they should not introduce it for other purposes, and he warned the Committee against the dangers of any such scheme. He would not detain the Committee any longer, but begged to move to leave out the word "compulsorily."

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 8, to leave out the word "compulsorily."—(*Colonel King-Harman.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, that as he knew the hon. and gallant Member (Colonel King-Harman), and others with him, felt very strongly on this matter, he trusted the Committee would pardon him for a few moments while he explained this word "compulsorily," and stated why the Government could not accept the Amendment. The Labourers Act of 1883, as it passed the House without any objection, was an exceptional piece of legislation. It gave power to purchase land for labourers' dwellings compulsorily, and it also gave power to take leases of land for the same purpose; but that was not compulsory. It was found, however, that the expenses of title were so great, that the Boards of Guardians could not purchase the land, and after an experience of 12 months it was found that the Act was a dead letter; and as the Irish Administration were anxious that it should not be a dead letter, they appointed a Committee to inquire into the matter. That Committee took a vast amount of evidence, and it was suggested before them that inasmuch as this was an Act of an exceptional character, and the amount of land taken was small, it would be desirable that a compulsory form of lease for 99 years should be given. He might point out that the very best security for the rent was given, as it was charged on the Union rates. The tenant the landlord had was the Board of Guardians, and they were just as responsible as any other tenant. It seemed to him that the principal object of this Bill was to give this power of compulsory leasing, the other provisions being wholly subsidiary to it; and the proposal of the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel King-Harman) now was to strike out of the Bill that which was the most essential part of it. As he thought, therefore, that this provision was a very desirable one, and the only one that could make it a workable measure, he was obliged to refuse to strike it out, and therefore the Amendment could not be accepted.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, he would like to point out to the hon. and learned Attorney General that his argument that the Bill of 1883 passed through without opposition was one which he would not have used if he had been in the House at the time. It was brought in late in the Session, and was not opposed, because they believed that the statement that the labourers required cottages to be built was perfectly sound. They said, however, that they would move Amendments in Committee; but the Committee was taken at about 3 o'clock one morning, and it was impossible for the one or two Members who were present on that occasion to discuss the matter at such an hour, therefore it was passed through without serious opposition. He maintained that the real state of the case was this. This clause had been put in to prevent the Treasury from having to apply for an extension of time for the repayment, and the whole thing was to be done at the expense of the unfortunate landlord.

MR. TOTTENHAM said, he entirely agreed with all that had fallen from his hon. and gallant Friend who had just spoken. [*Ironical cheers from the Irish Members.*] He congratulated the Government on the cheers they had been able to obtain from the hon. Members opposite. There was no necessity whatever for this Bill, which appeared to him to be a further nibbling at the interests of the Irish landlords, which, he thought, had been done already to a sufficient extent during the last few years.

MR. SEXTON said, the hon. and gallant Gentleman did not oppose this Bill on principle; but he would point out that if this provision were struck out the Labourers Act would become a mere cypher, as the Boards of Guardians would not go on, as they had been doing under the old Act, in tho costly way that they had. Was the convenience of a few landlords who wished to sell their estates and abandon their country to stand in the way in such a question as this?

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. SEXTON moved to leave out from the word "Act," in line 27, to the end of the sub-section. The words which he proposed to get rid of provided that the order of the Court should be subject to the same stamp duty as if it were a lease, and that a duplicate should be supplied at the expense of the Sanitary Authority. He could not see why an order or lease of this sort, which was given as a matter of public policy, should of necessity have a stamp at all. He did not think it should have a stamp. They ought to exercise economy as much as possible. Another thing. He did not see why the Sanitary Authority should be put to the expense of making a copy of their agreement.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 27, to leave out from "Act," to end of Sub-section (3).—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, it had always been a rule that stamps should be insisted upon in these matters, and he thought it would be very bad to make an exception in this particular instance. He was obliged to retain the clause as it stood.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, this was a matter in which the Irish Members felt inclined to persevere. The hon. and learned Member had himself referred to the Committee which had sat to inquire into the working of the Act of 1883; and he (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) found that that Committee reported that the amount of rent that could be got from the Irish labourers would be very small indeed, and every witness appeared to agree in the opinion that they should minimize the expenses under this Bill to the very finest point—to the very last penny. Therefore, he would appeal to the right hon. Baronet (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach). They were dealing with an exceptional case, with a very hard case of distress, and he hoped the Government would see their way to accept the Amendment.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he would consent to accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for Sligo in a modified form.

MR. COURTNEY said, he thought the Government had done just the opposite to what most people would have done. If an order in Court were made under the Act, there would be no necessity for drawing up the lease—it would be sufficient to do away with the lease, and therefore there would be no necessity for drawing up a lease. The acceptance of the Amendment, therefore, would really mean a State subvention, however small to the Boards of Guardians. If the landlord refused to grant a lease, the order of the Court would come in and the lease would escape the ordinary stamp duty. He thought the hon. Baronet the Secretary to the Treasury should rise and explain how it was that the Government proposed to make this gift or bonus to the Boards of Guardians. The Treasury appeared to be giving away what was part of the Revenue of the country, and he was obliged to say that the proposal struck him with extreme surprise.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he did not know whether the hon. Member for Liskeard had a copy of the Bill; but he thought it would be found that there would be a stamp on the order. The clause did not substitute the order for the lease.

MR. COURTNEY said, he could not assent to that for one moment. The Court might, if they thought fit, require a lease to be prepared and executed; but the drawing up of the lease depended on the discretion of the Court. The hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) did not seem to understand the point. If a landlord refused to give a lease, then this clause operated and made a lease compulsory; an order of the Court would be made which would operate as a lease. The sub-section preceding gave the Court power to require the authorities to renew the lease depended on the discretion of the Court, and therefore nothing turned on that point. It was assumed that the order was not a lease, whereas the order declared that it should operate as if it were a lease, and that being so it ought to be subject to stamp duty. If the lease were executed in two parts, by the landlord and the authorities, then there was no need of a stamp. He called on the hon. Gentleman to say why the stamp was given up.

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, he should have thought that anyone acquainted with the class of Acts, of which this was one, would know that the order of the Court should bear a stamp. It was under such Acts necessary to apply to the Court to make what was called a vesting order. The words meant that the order of the Court was to operate in the same manner, and have the same effect, as if it were a lease. The previous part of the sub-section exactly defined what were the rights, conditions, and so forth, so that the meaning was that the order of the Court would vest in the lessee the same interest which he would take if a lease had been executed. It was the more common form to provide that the order should bear a stamp; and if the Government proposed to give up that, all he could say was that it would be an absolute innovation in Bills of this kind.

MR. INCE said, with reference to the suggestion of the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) as to the parties being required to show their title, he could conceive of nothing that would be better than the order of the Court. They would have the best possible title in the order itself, which would be on the records of the Court; and if they wanted anything to show they could have an official copy of the order, and the lessee would have the best secondary evidence of showing the document under which he held.

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) said, this was the first time his attention had been called to the point raised by the hon. Member for Liskeard. He could not consent to the country losing the amount of stamp duty, and the order of the Court should bear the stamp; but he proposed that with a view to saving expense to the lessee the Proviso should be omitted.

Amendment proposed, in line 28, to leave out from "Provided" to the end of the sub-section."—(*Sir Henry Holland.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. CALLAN said, he hoped at that hour the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney) and the hon. and learned Member for Christchurch (Mr. Horace Davey) would not throw any difficulties in the way of the Treasury Bench.

MR. SEXTON said, he accepted the saving and the Amendment of the hon. Baronet; but the proposal did not commend itself to his economic conscience, for the saving would have to be secured out of the poor rates.

MR. TOTTENHAM said, he should like to know why a landlord should not have his own record of what had taken place? Why should he have to procure a copy of the record at considerable expense to himself?

COLONEL NOLAN said, it was to the interest of the landlord that these leases should not be drawn, because otherwise the landlord would have to pay a good deal to the poor rates. The solicitors would probably make £5 or £10 out of each operation. For his own part, he would much rather pay the stamp duty and have done with the matter. He dreaded the making out of these legal forms. He had known a case where £300 was paid over land worth £350. He had a great fear of all these Provisos.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, it was perfectly absurd to give a compulsory lease for half an acre of land. Some of the most eminent lawyers in the House had shown the absurdity of the clause, and he should therefore divide the Committee against it.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 87; Noes 7: Majority 80.—(Div. List, No. 267.)

Clauses 5 to 7, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Compensation for loss by compulsory taking of land).

MR. SEXTON moved the omission of the clause, on the ground that it would tend to make the Bill unworkable. The Local Government Board Inspector had unlimited power; and, therefore, he (Mr. Sexton) did not see that any case for compensation would arise.

Amendment proposed, in page 3, to leave out Clause 8.—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he thought it would be well to allow the clause to stand. As a general rule no compensation would be awarded; it would only be given in exceptional cases. Both in the interest of the landlord and also of the occupying tenant, it was advisable there should be some clause of this kind.

MR. GRAY asked, what case could arise which could not be met by the adjustment of the rent?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, the hon. Gentleman would notice that it was not only the owner but the occupier of the land taken who might be compensated for any loss, injury, or damage occasioned by the taking of the land. It was possible that if the rent were increased an injustice would be done to the occupier.

MR. SEXTON said, the powers of the Local Government Board Inspector enabled him to take care that there was no severance. The tenant was amply protected already. He thought that, at any rate, the Government ought to put in words indicating the exceptional cases.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE) said that should be done.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, it was quite true that the Local Government Board Inspector could order a cottage to be erected where he pleased; but there was much more to be taken into consideration than that. If half an acre was taken out of the farm and handed over to a labourer a certain amount of injury would be done which would be injury to the occupier as well as to the owner. There should be compensation in such a case; especially as the compulsory taking of land was always compensated for.

MR. P. J. POWER remarked, that the Local Government Board Inspector would assuredly take care that no injury was done.

MR. SEXTON asked if the Government would introduce words on Report?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he would suggest, on Report, to insert, after "award," "if the circumstances of the case so require."

MR. COURTNEY agreed so far with hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway that he did not see the necessity of this clause. Injury to the occupier was provided for in the matter of rent, as well as injury to the owner; but it would be observed that by this clause compensation was to be given for loss and damage—

> "Not compensated for by the rent payable to such owner, or by the apportionment of the rent payable by such occupier."

Clearly, under the lease to be granted, the rental to be paid would be reduced *pro tanto*. The whole matter might be compensated for by a reduction of rent.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, the matter was thrashed out in the Committee Room. Amongst other things, it was pointed out that injury might be done by goats and fowls.

MR. GRAY thought the remarks of the hon. and gallant Gentleman made it very necessary that the Committee should consider the propriety of putting in stronger words than those suggested by the right hon. and learned Gentleman. The hon. and gallant Gentleman considered that the owner should be compensated for any injuries done by goats or fowls.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN protested against this attempt to hoodwink the Committee. It was absurd to say that he was in favour of the owner being compensated for injury done by this trespass.

SIR JOSEPH M'KENNA considered the law against trespass was strong enough to leave the tenant to seek redress for himself.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR thought the observations of the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel King-Harman) constituted a strong argument against the retention of this clause. The hon.

and gallant Gentleman considered that fowls would injure the property of the occupying tenant. They might assume that most of the labourers would keep fowls; and, therefore, according to the argument of the hon. and gallant Gentleman, every property would be injured, and there would be a case for compensation. In other words, the hon. and gallant Gentleman thought there would be compensation over and above the rent in every single case where land was compulsorily taken and a labourer's cottage was erected. That was just the reason why the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) objected to this clause. The hon. Gentleman objected to the clause, because it would give an opportunity for vexatious and bogus claims for compensation, and thus be an impediment to the operation of the Act. If the hour were not so advanced (2.50), he would advise his hon. Friend (Mr. Sexton) to persevere with his objection to this clause, because if he did he would find a large amount of support. At all events, his hon. Friend ought to prosecute his objection so far as to obtain an assurance from the Attorney General for Ireland that the words introduced should be such as to exclude the interpretation which the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel King-Harman) sought to put on the clause.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he had already stated what words he was prepared to introduce on Report. The clause would only apply to exceptional cases, and on Report he would be able to insert three or four words which would make that clear.

MR. SEXTON contended that the very existence of the clause in the Act would encourage every fractious landlord in the country to make bogus claims. Therefore, unless the clause was to be struck out, the words ought to be very strong indeed—"The court in any exceptional case in which it may see cause may award," or some such words. It ought to be made clear that if landlords made bogus claims they would suffer.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, the hon. Gentleman had spoken about fractious landlords. The hon. Gentleman knew perfectly well that one of the great reasons why the present Act had not worked was that it was opposed by the occupying tenants. [Mr. SEXTON: I do not believe it.] His experience justified him in saying so. What the occupying tenants dreaded was that cottages would be put up in places where they would be an annoyance to them. The Act would work much more smoothly if it was made apparent to the occupier that if he was injuriously affected there was a reasonable chance of his being compensated.

MR. MOLLOY thought it would be much better that when any land was taken from an occupier his rent should be reduced by the amount which the Guardians paid to the landlord.

Amendment *negatived.*

Clauses 9 to 11, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Provisional Orders.

Clause 12 (Provisional Order may be confirmed by the Privy Council).

COLONEL KING-HARMAN proposed the insertion of "or occupier," after "owner," in line 14.

Amendment proposed, in page 5, line 14, after the word "owner," to insert the words "or occupier."—(*Colonel King-Harman.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SEXTON said, there was very serious objection to the Amendment, and he hoped the Government had no idea of accepting it. This was a case where a Provisional Order had been granted by the Local Government Board. If there was no opposition the Provisional Order took effect; but if there was opposition all the costs of an appearance in Court would be incurred. That would make all the difference between a cheap scheme and a dear one. There were some landlords in Ireland who were reckless, and others who were cunning. A cunning landlord would put some mean sneak in as occupier. Therefore, if the word "occupier" were inserted here, there was hardly a scheme which would not be opposed by the occupier, acting not for himself, but for the landlord.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, that if an acre or two were taken out of a holding of 30 or 40 acres it would not matter much; but a case occurred in Westmeath lately where an occupier of five acres was pounced upon by the Sanitary Authority for some reason best known to them, and half an acre of his best land taken from him for a labourer. The occupier did not want a labourer. If he had had double the acreage he would have been able to till it. Was that unfortunate man, or were men in a similar position, not to be allowed to petition?

Mr. SEXTON said, the Local Government Board Inspector told the Select Committee that they never allowed a cottage to be put on a farm of less than 20 or 25 acres.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel King-Harman) had taken up two very antagonistic positions. A few moments ago he said the great obstacle to the working of the Labourers' Act was the unwillingness of the occupiers to have labourers on their farms. [Colonel King-Harman: No; I did not.] He certainly understood the hon. and gallant Gentleman to say that of the two, landlords and tenants, the tenants were the greater obstacles. Having made that statement, he now proposed to give every occupier the power of imposing a very serious and costly litigation upon any Board of Guardians who proposed to erect labourers' cottages. If the Amendment were accepted the Bill might as well be torn into pieces.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) saw no objection at all to the Amendment. It must be borne in mind that the tenant had quite as great an interest in the matter as the landlord, and therefore it would be unreasonable to deprive him of the same right of appeal as the landlord. The Amendment seemed to him to be in accordance with the principles of justice.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA said, he hoped the Government would not agree to the Amendment, on the ground that it would increase the conflict between classes in Ireland.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR asked the Attorney General for Ireland if a whole scheme would be destroyed by the objection of one landlord applied to one cottage on a particular farm? Now, the point brought before the Labourers' Committee was this, that the whole of an important scheme extending over 70 or 80 cottages might be destroyed by the objection of one landlord applied to only one cottage. A case of that kind had occurred.

Colonel KING-HARMAN: Where did that case occur?

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he believed it was on the estate of Lord Dunally at Nenagh. Lord Dunally objected to one or two cottages in the whole scheme of the Nenagh Board of Guardians, and that scheme fell through because of his Lordship's objection. [Colonel King-Harman: No, no.] He hoped the hon. and gallant Gentleman would hear him out. One of the questions the Committee had directed its attention to was the making of such improvements in the Act that the whole of the scheme should not depend upon the fate of a small portion of it. Here they might have that objectionable feature on an extended scale. The whole scheme extending over 70 or 80 cottages might fail because the occupier of one half an acre which it was sought to take for a single cottage might raise an objection. The clause dealt with by the Amendment was a capital point of the Bill; they were all agreed, and the hon. and gallant Member would bear him out, that if the process of raising these cottages were not minimized in the matter of expense the Bill would be a dead letter. Here, after both Administrators, acting on the Report of the Committee, had endeavoured to minimize the expenditure by doing away with the appeal to Parliament, and substituting appeal to the Privy Council, the hon. and gallant Gentleman came down and proposed an Amendment which would practically make every case contentious. It was really monstrous on the part of the Government to accept a proposal like that which would make every case contentious.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, the hon. Member was under a great mistake if he thought that the objection of a single owner would cause the whole scheme to be disallowed.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR: I said every case would be made contentious—I did not say disallowed.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes): The Privy Council has power to award costs against any person who presents a petition which ought not to be presented, and which would be considered frivolous. As all petitioning occupiers will be liable to the danger of having to pay costs, they would be careful not to bring frivolous objections.

Mr. SEXTON said, the occupiers of five-acre holdings, if they chose to object to the scheme, would have power to compel the Guardians to go to Dublin before the Privy Council. That would make the whole scheme far more expensive—the whole scheme, it might be of 100 cottages, more costly. What would happen if the Amendment were agreed to would be this—that the landlord would get one of his bailiffs on one of his farms to object. All he would have to do would be to get one of his bailiffs or understrappers to object; and in that manner kill the scheme or obstruct it. He (Mr. Sexton) warned the Committee that the Bill would be destroyed by the insertion of this Amendment.

Colonel KING-HARMAN asked the Committee to form its own opinion of the argument of the hon. Gentleman and his Colleagues. He made the reckless charge that the landlords—who were as honourable a set of men as any in the Three Kingdoms—were so discreditable that when one heard of a scheme of which he disapproved he would get his bailiffs or understrappers to object, with the intention of getting rid of the whole scheme. Such a suggestion was not worth a moment's consideration. In the case of Lord Dunally and the Mullingar Guardians, an appeal was made in regard to certain parts of a scheme, and though those particular cottages were thrown out the scheme did not fall through—the remainder of it was passed. A man—an unfortunate man with only five acres of land, it might be—if he objected, could relieve himself from having a cottage placed on his holding; but the remainder of the cottages in the scheme might be built. Was it not right that the Guardians should be at liberty to consider the case of the man with five acres, and give him as much consideration as though he were a large landed proprietor?

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA asked whether they could not fairly leave the protection of the tenant to the landlord? If the tenant went to the landlord and objected, if the landlord was a good one, could it not be left to him to defend his tenant? If the farm was a small one, or if it was inconvenient to have a cottage built, could it not be left to his moral courage to go to the Privy Council?

Colonel KING-HARMAN: The owner may be a minor or an absentee.

Mr. P. J. POWER said, that if the Amendment were adopted, it might not have the effect of killing an improvement scheme, but it would have the effect of retarding it and greatly increasing its cost. Perhaps the right hon. and learned Attorney General for Ireland could frame some Amendment to give the tenant the right to apply to the Local Government Board or to the Privy Council to have his case reconsidered. Could it not be done in such a way that the effect of his requiring to have his case looked into would not necessarily retard the scheme?

Mr. MOLLOY said, the right hon. and learned Gentleman had said that the whole question was a question of extra costs, and that the costs were in the discretion of the Court. That was fallacious, because the right hon. and learned Gentleman knew as well as he (Mr. Molloy) did that even if the slightest case was shown by the tenant the costs would not be thrown on him. Therefore, he thought a statement of that kind was not to be defended.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. SEXTON said, that, as the Bill at present stood, three ratepayers would be able to bring a case before the Privy Council, and the cost, under any circumstances, would not, he should think, exceed 1*d.* or 2*d.* in the pound. The Amendment he offered was that it should require as many ratepayers to bring the Sanitary Authorities before the Privy Council as it did to launch an arbitration, which was 12.

Amendment proposed, in page 5, line 17, to leave out the word "three," and insert the word "twelve."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'three' stand part of the Clause."

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke) said, he saw nothing magical in the word three.

Colonel KING-HARMAN hoped the Amendment would not be accepted. If they made it 12, why not 24? He considered that three were quite as many as should be required to object and to ask that a case should be thoroughly investigated by a Local Government Inspector.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. SEXTON said, that the Bill provided that Petitions against the taking of land should be heard by the Privy Council. Well, he had had a close acquaintance with the proceedings of the Select Committee, whose every meeting he had attended, and whose every witness he had seen, and he was, therefore, in a position to say that the general tendency of the evidence was not to recommend the Privy Council, but the Land Commission. The Privy Council was little know in Ireland, and was less trusted than it was known. It was composed of Judges and other eminent persons; but it sat fitfully in Dublin, he believed, and an appearance before it was a costly thing. His proposal in the Amendment on the Paper was that the Land Commission should be the tribunal to hear these cases. The Commission was now composed of three members; but it was proposed in a Bill now before Parliament to appoint two others. That was a Court which could go to the suitors, instead of requiring the suitors to come up to Dublin; and it was a Court, which was better known to the people—though they had anything but perfect confidence in it. It would, however, inspire greater confidence than the proposal in the Bill.

Amendment proposed,

In page 5, line 26, to leave out the words "Lord Lieutenant, acting with the advice of the Privy Council in Ireland," and insert the words "the Court."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, it seemed to him that the Amendment proposed by the hon. Member was one the Government could not accept. One of the recommendations of the Committee had been that the Privy Council should be substituted for Parliament.

Mr. SEXTON: No; the proposal was that the authority should be either the Privy Council or the Land Commission.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, that, after carefully considering the matter, they had come to the conclusion that the best tribunal would be the Privy Council. It had on many occasions acted in a similar manner—for instance, under the Tramways Act. As to the composition of the Privy Council, it must be remembered that almost all the distinguished Judges in Ireland were Members of it, and that these cases were heard by a Judicial Committee of the Council. These matters were heard in full Court; they were fully discussed; and nobody in the whole of Ireland would be better able to deal with such matters.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he failed to see the cogency of the argument of the right hon. and learned Gentleman. Here was a question dealing with the valuation of land; they had a tribunal in the Land Commission whose duty it was to consider this subject—which was daily employed in dealing with it. They had, therefore, a Commission which was daily engaged in the very work to which this Bill had reference. The Privy Council, on the other hand, was a Body which was never called upon to deal with questions of the valuation of land. It was called on to deal with questions of policy, but not to deal with questions affecting fair rents and other matters which were daily under the consideration of the Land Commission. Then, as an hon. Friend behind him suggested, the attendance at this Privy Council Court would be the attendance of the Judges of the land, who had other work to do. Their attendance was accidental and irregular. They dropped in "promiscuous-like," to use the phrase of Dickens. They were not regularly employed, and they sat in Dublin; whereas the other tribunal was of a perambulating character.

Colonel COLTHURST quite agreed in the contention that the Land Commission would be the better authority, and hoped the Government would consider the proposal.

Mr. LEA said, that some of them in the North of Ireland felt very strongly that the power which was placed in the hands of the Privy Council had crushed the Tramways Act, and he hoped it would be done away with in this matter rather than it should be allowed to crush this Act. He would certainly

Stuart). Seeing that such a proposal was made by a landlord, he thought he ought to accept the suggestion.

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, he should have no objection whatever to agree to the Amendment, if certain words were inserted in it. He did not think it right to make it compulsory on the landland to sell the best portions of his land for the purpose of the Bill. He was willing to accept the Amendment, with the addition of the words "by agreement."

Mr. SEXTON said, he hoped the mind of the Government remained open on this subject. The object was to save expense. It was absurd that because a labourer lived in a bad house the public purse was to be used in buying for his benefit a house and land, while the man who had a good house was to get nothing. It was simply a question of a good or bad dwelling; and he could not understand what the intention of the Government was with regard to it.

Mr. GRAY said, this was probably the most important point in connection with the whole Bill. The proposal of the hon. Member, if adopted, would confer an enormous benefit, and he trusted that the Government would consider it favourably. It was the one Amendment put down to the Bill which had a consensus of opinion in its favour. It was agreed on all hands that the clause would be most useful; and he thought that the argument of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) in its favour was very strong—that was to say, that if a man had a bad cottage, he was to get the benefit of the Bill, and that if he had a good one he was not to have it. The Amendment, if made, would revolutionize the condition of labourers in Ireland, and would, on the whole, be of immense benefit.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, in its present form, the Government certainly could not accept the proposal. It would constitute too great an alteration of the Bill.

Mr. VILLIERS-STUART said, he was ready to accept an Amendment from the hon. and gallant Member for Dublin County (Colonel King-Harman) in the direction he had indicated.

Mr O'KELLY said, he hoped the Government would see their way to accept the Amendment suggested by the hon. and gallant Member for Dublin County—namely, to add the words "by agreement," after "purchase." He could see no objection whatever to that; they were simply seeking to extend the advantages of the Bill to labourers living in villages and small towns.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he was willing to agree to the Amendment suggested by the hon. and gallant Member for Dublin County (Colonel King-Harman); but as he was not prepared to accept the words of the hon. Member for Waterford as they stood on the Paper, he suggested that the matter should stand over until the Report.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, it would be a very easy thing for the Attorney General for Ireland to agree to insert the words "by agreement," which would remove all difficulty in the matter.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, to insert, after the word "purchase," in line 2, the words "by agreement."—(*Mr. T. P. O'Connor.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Original Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 16 (Closing of dwellings unfit for habitation).

Mr. SEXTON said, this clause cast on the Inspector of the Local Government Board the duty of prosecuting the owner of any house which might be unfit for habitation, and in the result the house might be ordered to be demolished. It would be seen, however, that the demolition might be postponed until the house was empty, which would have the effect of defeating the object they had in view. He, therefore, proposed to leave out the words "may, if they think fit," in order that the word "shall" be inserted.

Amendment proposed,

In page 9, line 30, to leave out the words "may, if they think fit," and insert the word "shall."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. GRAY said, he was of opinion that it would be better to omit this clause altogether. There was already a duty cast upon the Sanitary Authorities with regard to habitations unfit for occupation by a long and complex Code. It was the duty of the Sanitary Authorities to find out houses unfit for habitation, under the Public Health Acts, and it was the duty of the Guardians to proceed against the owner of the house and compel it to be closed, and then it was the duty of the Local Government Board to see that the Sanitary Authority did its duty and had the house closed. The proposal now made was to release the Sanitary Authority of the duty cast upon it by another Act of Parliament. He asked the Attorney General for Ireland to bear with him for a few moments. The Act imposed a specific duty on the Sanitary Authority in the case of any house unfit for habitation. Suppose the local Inspector certified that a house was unfit for habitation, and suppose the Sanitary Authority availed itself of its right under this Act, it would be necessary to get an injunction to compel it to do its duty. This Bill contradicted the Public Health Acts; and, therefore, he thought it would be better to strike out the whole section. If it was to be maintained at all, it ought to be made a working section by imposing on the Authorities the duty of providing a good house, if once the house in which the man was living was proved to be unfit for habitation. But the Government shrank from doing that, and the result was that they proposed what was a contradiction of the existing law, because by the existing law a certain duty was imposed on the Sanitary Authority, and by this clause it was exempted from performing it.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. GRAY: I propose to leave out the clause altogether.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member can vote against the clause when it is put.

MR. CALLAN: I propose to leave out Sub-section 4.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member proposes to leave out a section which the Committee have already agreed to amend.

MR. CALLAN said, the last Amendment was to omit the words "may, if they think fit," and insert "shall." His proposal was to omit the sub-section.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member cannot go back to the words "Sanitary Authorities," and propose to leave them out because an Amendment has been made subsequent to that.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he had listened to what had been stated by the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray); but, according to his recollection, there was no inconsistency between the clause and the existing law. However, the matter should be considered before the Report.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Miscellaneous.

Clause 17 (Miscellaneous Amendments of Act of 1883).

On Motion of Mr. SEXTON, the following Amendment made:—Page 9, line 39, leave out from "one," inclusive, to end of line 41, and insert "any time."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 18 (Definitions).

MR. SEXTON proposed the omission of the word "principal," in line 29, and urged upon the Government the vital importance of accepting the Amendment. The definition of an agricultural labourer had been found to be the greatest impediment in the application of the present Act. In some cases the schemes of Boards of Guardians had fallen through altogether, because the Inspector of the Local Government Board could not be satisfied that the principal occupation of the labourers was that of agricultural labour. There were many places in Ireland where the labourer could only get work on farms during the spring operations, in the harvest-time, and when the potatoes were being put in—in all about 16 weeks' work. It was not the fault of those poor men that they could not get agricultural labour through the year. When agricultural labour failed, they mended the roads or drove cars—and, indeed, anything they could get to do. Why should those men be deprived of the benefit of the Act? The town labourer was provided for by law; why should not the labourer be provided for who did as much agricultural work as as he could get? The hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) proposed, and he (Mr. Sexton) moved the Amendment in his hon. Friend's name, that an agricultural labourer—

> "Shall mean a person whose occupation during any part of the year is the doing of agricultural work."

By "any part of the year" was meant the agricultural season. The Government were not spending their own money; the local rates would have to supply every 1*d*. spent on the operation of the Act. From an Imperial point of view, from the point of view of statesmen desiring to put an end to discontent in Ireland, he could not understand how anyone could refuse the definition of an agricultural labourer which he now suggested. It was clear to him that unless Parliament accepted in a bold spirit the state of Ireland as it was, they would leave such a condition of things behind as would create the necessity for another amending Bill next year, or the year after.

Amendment proposed, in page 10, line 29, to leave out the word "principal."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'principal' stand part of the Clause."

MR. GRAY said, there was absolutely no reason for the retention of the definition of an agricultural labourer found in the clause. The object of this Bill should be to extend the benefit of the Artizans' Dwellings Act to the inhabitants of rural districts who had not the benefit of the legislation, and who ought not to be shut off from it by any artificial restrictions. He trusted the Government would accept the Amendment of his hon. Friend, as it would remove a great grievance, and one which was a source of much heartburning.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, the Amendment was one of a very serious character. He did not think there would be any difficulty in ascertaining what men could be properly described as agricultural labourers. To fulfil the conditions, it was not necessary that a man should do agricultural work every day in the week. He could not accept the Amendment, because it seemed to him that its introduction would bring in an entirely different class of men to that contemplated by the Bill.

MR. O'SHEA asked whether the Government would, under the circumstancs, put words in the Bill to show clearly what was an agricultural labourer. The Attorney General for Ireland had said it was not necessary for a man to labour every day in the week. He (Mr. O'Shea) had considerable experience in various parts of the West of Ireland; and he could not help thinking that unless some Amendment of this kind were accepted the Bill would benefit very few men. It might possibly be that the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Sexton) went too far; but, at the same time, it was perfectly evident that the clause, as it now stood, did not go far enough. Could not the Government propose something as a go-between?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) said, that this Bill went further in the direction hon. Members desired than the Act 47 *Vict.* c. 60. In that Act the words were "a person who habitually works for hire." In this Bill the words were—

> "A person whose principal occupation is the doing of agricultural work."

There was a great difference between the two sets of words. He did not anticipate the slightest difficulty in ascertaining who was, and who was not, an agricultural labourer. This Bill certainly went further than the Act of 1883.

MR. SEXTON asked if the Government would say—

> "A person whose principal occupation during the chief or regular seasons of agricultural work is the doing of agricultural work?"

If the definition was not wide enough to cover men who at times could not get agricultural work, thousands of men would be shut out from the benefit of the Act.

COLONEL COLTHURST said, that perhaps the Attorney General for Ireland would consider the point between this and Report. The present definition would exclude the many labourers in County Cork who could only get agricultural labour during certain periods of the year.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he had no objection to consider the matter by Report; but he doubted still whether he could find words which would aptly express the object they had in view.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, that if the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland would read the evidence given before the Select Committee by the Inspectors of the Local Government Board, he would find that those officials had been compelled to exclude a vast number of labourers from the operation of the present Act, because, during a portion of the year, they did other than agricultural work. The words of the present Act, which the Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) had read, were the result of a compromise which was hurriedly arrived at. He did not, therefore, attach very much importance to the words, though he believed he himself suggested them. Anyhow, he assured the Secretary to the Treasury and the Attorney General for Ireland that a large number of men who really were agricultural labourers had been excluded from the benefit of the present Act by the definition which was adopted. It was a well-known fact that in Ireland men could only get agricultural labour during certain portions of the year, and that at other times they fished, or broke stones, or drove cars. Surely there was no valid reason why those poor creatures should be deprived of any benefit which the Act conferred.

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. SEXTON proposed to insert, after "herdsman," in line 31, "and a widow who does farm work." Anyone who knew Ireland knew that very often when a man died a widow continued to work the farm. He supposed there was no intention in any quarter to deprive women of the advantages of the Act. It was well the matter should be made clear, and, therefore, he proposed this Amendment.

Amendment proposed, in page 10, line 31, after the word "herdsman," to insert the words "and a widow who does farm work."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he had no objection to make it clear that "agricultural labourer" should include women; but he did not think this Amendment would serve that purpose, for it was certainly very ambiguous. Words might be introduced on Report.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. SEXTON proposed to insert the words "wholly or partly," after "not," in line 32, so that the clause would read—

"The term does not include any person who is not wholly or partly paid for his labour by wages."

In many parts of Ireland labourers were paid partly by wages and partly in kind. It was as well the point should be made clear.

Amendment proposed, in page 10, line 32, after the word "not," to insert the words "wholly or partly."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

COLONEL KING-HARMAN: Sir Arthur Otway, I desired to speak upon the Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: I am very sorry I did not notice the hon. and gallant Gentleman rise; but he cannot now speak upon the Amendment.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN: I bow to your decision, Sir; but I rose before you put the Question.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have no doubt the hon. and gallant Gentleman is quite correct; but I did not notice him.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN: I beg to move that you do report Progress.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again,"—(*Colonel King-Harman,*)—put, and *negatived.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 19 to 21, inclusive, *agreed to.*

MR. SEXTON proposed, after Clause 13, to insert the following new Clause:—

(Order confirmed before the passing of this Act may be superseded by new Order.)

"When a sanitary authority has not obtained and applied a Treasury loan in pursuance of a Provisional Order made and confirmed by Parliament before the passing of this Act, such Order may be allowed to lapse, and such sanitary authority may avail itself of the provisions of this Act in applying for a new Provisional Order, and may proceed in all respects as if the original Order had not been made and confirmed."

He thought this clause would recommend itself to the Government. It was an attempt to meet the case of Sanitary Authorities who had already obtained power. Those Authorities had to purchase land or would purchase land, and it might be a very expensive operation. As this Act would enable Sanitary Authorities to lease land as well as buy it, he proposed that the old power should lapse and the Authorities be permitted to proceed by the cheaper method.

New Clause,—(*Mr. Sexton*),—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) was understood to say he would consider the question involved in the clause by Report.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

The CHAIRMAN said, that the new clause, "Appointment of inspectors of labourers' dwellings," standing in the name of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Waterford (Mr. Villiers-Stuart), could not be put, because it voted public money; and that the clause, "Repayment of loans," standing in the name of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell), could not be put for the same reason.

Mr. SEXTON asked if the Government would make an announcement on the subject of the repayment of loans? Perhaps it would be well that he should move to report Progress, in order to afford the Government an opportunity of stating their intentions.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Sir William Hart Dyke) said, he did not know whether he would be in Order in making an explanation.

Mr. SEXTON: I move to report Progress, on the ground that we cannot well proceed without knowing what the Government propose.

The CHAIRMAN: Probably the Committee will allow the right hon. Gentleman to make a short explanation.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke) was understood to say that it was proposed to extend the time of repayment, and that, in future, loans to be repaid in 40 years would be advanced at the rate of $3\frac{1}{4}$ per cent per annum, and those to be repaid in more than 40 years at $3\frac{3}{4}$ per cent per annum.

Mr. SEXTON said, he did not wish to make any observation on that statement.

The CHAIRMAN: I am calling on the hon. Member to move the latter part of his next Amendment—the first part of it cannot be put.

Mr. SEXTON said, he begged to move the new clause—"Allowances to Sanitary Authority out of a general rate"—standing in the name of the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). The great impediment in the way of the working of this Act would be the desire on the part of Boards of Guardians for the saving of expense; and the hon. Member for the City of Cork and his Friends had considered the matter, and had come to the conclusion that it would bridge over the difficulty if they arranged that the Sanitary Authority should be allowed, out of a rate to be anually levied for the purpose; one-third, payable annually by such Sanitary Authority in respectof each house and plot provided under the provisions of the Labourers' Act, 1883, or of the present Bill. The rate would be levied on the Poor Law Valuation, and it was provided in the clause that the rate so levied should not exceed 1*d.* in the pound. He thought public opinion in Ireland would cheerfully accede to such a rate as that for the purpose of providing comfortable houses for poor labourers. He did not believe that the sum required would reach 1*d.* in the pound. A penny on the Poor Law Valuation of Ireland would pay for 40,000 houses, whereas the total number it was proposed to erect at the time the Committee sat was only 3,000. So that the Committee would see that in the five years in which it was proposed to carry out this work the sum which would be required would not amount to 1*d.* in the pound. The allowance to the Board of Guardians would be £1 5*s.* 6*d.*, and the labourers would pay £2 12*s.*, which would leave only a small balance to be imposed as a burden on the local rates. It was where the Act was needed most that, under existing circumstances, there was the least chance of its being put in force. If the Committee would allow this clause to be put into the Bill he was sure they would be removing an impediment in the way of the working of the Act which in a very short time would put an end to the discontent of the labourers. He begged to move the insertion of the following new Clause:—

New Clause:—

(Allowances to sanitary authority out of a general rate.)

"Each sanitary authority which becomes liable for repayment of loans under 'The Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1883,' or this Act, shall be allowed, out of a rate to be annually levied for the purpose on the Poor Law Valuation of

Ireland, one-third of the amount payable annually by such sanitary authority in respect of each house and plot provided in virtue of the provisions of 'The Labourers' (Ireland) Act, 1883,' or of this Act: Provided, That such rate to be so levied shall not exceed one penny in the pound: Provided also, That no such allowance shall exceed in any case the annual sum of one pound five shillings and sixpence in respect of each such house and plot of land,"—(*Mr. Sexton,*)

—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, this clause was a very serious one, and he did not think it would be possible for the Government to accept it. This rate would be struck on towns as well as on country districts, and he did not see how they could well tax urban residents in order to build cottages for agricultural labourers. Such a thing would neither be fair nor just; and, having reference to the fact that towns in Ireland had already enough to do for the maintenance of the poor, he thought it would be very unfair to ask them to pay any part of this rate. Besides that, there might be many districts in Ireland where, through the industry and thrift of the inhabitants, the labouring classes were well-housed. Why should they contribute towards the expense of providing labourers' cottages for other parts of the country?

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he should like to point out that this proposal was made on the Labourers' Committee. It was discussed there, and there was no very great objection raised to it on the part of the English Members. The hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel King-Harman) had objected; but the hostility on the part of the English Members was that the proposal was brought forward just as the Committee was about to conclude its labours. He did not know whether the Committee was acquainted with the abortive legislation of the late Chief Secretary as to National teachers in Ireland. In that Bill the right hon. Gentleman had proposed a National rate for the benefit of the teachers. That seemed to him (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) a precedent upon which they could rely, because the right hon. Gentleman belonged to the same economic school as the hon. Member for Liskeard (Mr. Courtney), who was bearing present legislation with greater patience than they could have expected, and was confining his attention to the Stamp Duty in the Imperial taxes. If the Representatives of the people who would have to pay this rate were willing to support it before the Committee the sign was a good one, and the Committee should have no difficulty in acceding to the present demand. This question of labourers' dwellings in Ireland was really a National question. It was a question which affected the whole country. The country consisted of districts of varying prosperity, and the Irish Members thought it was only right that the tax should be equalized in the different districts by a National rate. He thought if the Irish Members were willing to pledge themselves to this proposal, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland should make no objection, but should leave them to make their peace with their constituents.

MR. COURTNEY said, that an expression had just now fallen from the hon. Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) which brought out a point he (Mr. Courtney) wished to submit to the Chairman. The hon. Member's statement was that this was a proposal to tax the whole of Ireland, and that the Irish Members agreed to it. He (Mr. Courtney) wished to know whether it was in Order for a private Member to propose to tax the whole of Ireland, and whether it was not a fact that such a proposal could not be made except on the authority of a Minister of the Crown?

THE CHAIRMAN: This is a question of rating, and I understand that such a question can be dealt with by the Committee. This is not a tax.

MR. COURTNEY said, he would submit to the right hon. Gentleman whether the present clause was in Order, seeing that it was not applied to a certain area, but to the whole of Ireland for the purpose of levying a tax?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is evident that a rate might be imposed by the Local Authority, and in that sense I understand that it can come within the province of the Committee to deal with it.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, he submitted that the argument used in favour of this clause cut entirely against it; because the object of the Bill was to put agricultural labourers into houses where there was no labour for them, and, therefore, no means for them to obtain support. The object of hon. Members who moved this clause was to take a number of men who subsisted by labour, to call them labourers, and to put them in houses to which they had no sort of title at the expense of the community.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 18; Noes 56: Majority 38. — (Div. List, No. 268.)

MR. SEXTON said, he now begged to move the next Amendment on the Paper, which was also in the name of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). At present, the Local Government Board in Dublin had power to say what the area charged should be; and hitherto they had exercised it in a most embarrassing manner, saying that it should be put upon the electoral division containing, at times, no more than half-a-dozen houses. To make the area the electoral division, as now proposed, would be to make it impossible to work the Act. If the Act was to work at all this Amendment should be accepted. He would urge the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland to give this matter his favourable consideration. The clause was carried by a large majority in the Committee. It would have the effect of equalizing the rate and of preventing very small bodies of occupiers from being seriously embarrassed by the pressure of the rate upon them. He would ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman whether, in deference to the opinion of the Irish Members, he could not see his way to accepting this clause in order to enable the Act to work? The clause was in these terms—

> "The area upon which any rate shall be levied by a sanitary authority for the discharge of any liability incurred for the purposes of 'The Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1883,' or of this Act, shall be the union at large."

New Clause (Area of charge for rate levied by sanitary authority,) — *(Mr. Sexton,)—brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE) said, that this question of area was a very large one, and he did not think the Committee could accept the clause.

MR. GRAY said, that hon. Members who represented Ireland were far more unanimous on this question in proportion to their number than were English Members, who changed the fate of Parties in this House. An enormous number of Irish Members were, and had been for years, in favour of Union rating. They were only proposing to apply in one special case in Ireland a rate they had insisted on having in England for a number of years. The rate the English Members had themselves they would not give to Ireland. He believed this Amendment to be absolutely vital to the Bill. It would be impossible to put the Bill in operation if taxation was to be put upon small areas, usually the poorest and least able to bear them in the Union. He would really ask the Government whether, seeing that this clause had been supported by a large majority in the Committee, and seeing the principle was adopted in England a long time ago, they could not adopt it, for he was sure it would have a satisfactory effect in remedying the evils they were suffering from in Ireland? He hoped that Irish Members would press this upon the Government very strongly, as he was sure that without this new clause the Bill would not work at all. If they had in Ireland a Local Government Board which really had the interest of the country at heart, and did not oppose themselves to the requirements of the districts, they would make areas which would somewhat relieve the pressure of taxation on the poorer districts. But, on the contrary, the Local Government Board always tried to restrict the areas and make them smaller than the Guardians themselves. He (Mr. Gray) was convinced that the labours of the Committee that night would be thrown away if they did not adopt this clause, because in districts where they wanted the Bill most the taxation would press with such severity on small areas that it would be impossible to carry out the intentions of the Act.

COLONEL COLTHURST said, he hoped the Government would favourably consider this Amendment. There could be no doubt it was vital to the success of the Bill, and he could not conceive upon what principle it could be resisted. For 20 years they had had Union rating in England. As he had ventured to mention before, the whole weight of official evidence in Ireland was in favour of it. The present Vice President of the Local Government Board had declared himself for Union rating on all but one point, and almost every official in Ireland connected with the Poor Law was in favour of it. He trusted that Her Majesty's Government would consider this matter between now and the Report.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA said, he hoped Her Majesty's Government would see their way to accepting the principle of this clause, because if these charges were thrown upon the narrow areas of the electoral divisions, irrespective of what the population was, it would lead in many cases to an enormous increase of taxation. If, however, the same principle was carried out which existed in England, that grievance would be removed. A grievance in this matter had existed to an enormous extent in Ireland.

Mr. SEXTON said, he was very sorry that the Government seemed to raise opposition to the abstract principle of this clause, and had seen fit to discard the opinion of the Select Committee. He should like to ask whether the mind of the Government was made up? Were they open to any further argument, because he wanted to save time? If they were not, he had one more suggestion to make, which was that the area on which this rate should be levied should be fixed by the Sanitary Authority. That was a compromise—would the Government accept it?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes): That is a proposition of a very different kind from the others, and we will consider it.

Mr. SEXTON: What are we to hope for? Does the right hon. and learned Gentleman see any objection to the proposal—is he ready to accept it?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes): I cannot say. I have not had an opportunity of considering the matter, or of ascertaining the feeling in the various parts of Ireland.

Mr. SEXTON: At any rate, the right hon. and learned Gentleman sees no objection to it at present?

The CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Member propose to withdraw the clause?

Mr. SEXTON: Yes; I withdraw it for the present.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. SEXTON begged to move the following new Clause:—

(Compulsory powers to purchase land without investigation of title.)

"For the purposes of 'The Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1883,' the Local Government Board may, by Provisional Order confirming any scheme under that Act, empower a sanitary authority to purchase compulsorily any lands referred to in said Order, and if no valid petition is lodged against the said Order, or if, after lodgment of a petition, the Order is confirmed, the Court shall make a vesting order transferring the interest of the owner to the sanitary authority upon such consideration as the Court may fix, and the title conferred by such vesting order shall be valid against the person from whom the land is purchased, and against all persons entitled to any incumbrance, estate, or interest in the land either paramount or subsequent to the estate or interest of such person."

He did not see why, in cases where the landlord was so well known and the matter was only a small one of a few acres, they should have to go to the expense and trouble of investigating the title.

New Clause,—(*Mr. Sexton,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he had looked carefully into this clause. Vesting orders would not be necessary, and he did not see his way to accepting the proposal of the hon. Member.

Mr. SEXTON asked whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman would consider it in the same friendly spirit that he had promised to consider the other matter?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes): I do not think so.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. SEXTON begged to move the following new Clause:—

(25 & 26 Vict. c. 83, s. 2, not to apply to holdings under this Act.)

"Notwithstanding the provision contained in the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth Victoria, chapter eighty-three, section two, with respect to out-door relief, it shall be lawful for any board of guardians to give out-door relief to any persons occupying a house erected by them in pursuance of 'The Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1883,' or this Act."

New Clause,—*(Mr. Sexton,)*—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he did not think that this Act would impose the burdens which the hon. Gentleman contemplated, and he could, therefore, see no reason for the proposed change in the law.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. SEXTON said, he hoped, at all events, that his last clause would be accepted, which was as follows:—

(Power to contractors to take building materials.)

"Any contractor or other person engaged in building houses for a sanitary authority, in pursuance of 'The Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1883,' or this Act, shall be entitled to take and use for such purpose stones, sand, or any material requisite for building, from quarries and other places from which such materials are ordinarily supplied, paying for the same the price current for such materials in the district."

He was desirous that the contractors building houses under this Bill should have the same power to take building materials as they had under the Grand Juries, otherwise there would probably be great impediments put in their way.

New Clause,—*(Mr. Sexton,)*—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, it appeared to him that if a man would pay a fair price he could get what he wanted. He thought the acceptance of this clause would be introducing a very curious provision, and he did not think the Government could consent to insert it.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR thought the right hon. and learned Gentleman was inaccurate in stating that they were introducing a novel provision, for in previous Acts it had been provided that contractors should have the right of going in and buying materials at the current market price. He thought it was a very small matter, and he could not understand why the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposed it. The hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (Colonel King-Harman) did not oppose the Amendment. [An hon. MEMBER: He will.] He would be very much surprised if even the hon. and gallant Member opposed it. They really ought to give the contractor the same power in a case such as this as they did under the Grand Juries.

MR. TOTTENHAM said, the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) was mistaken. The contractor, under the Grand Jury, had the power of obtaining materials for road-making or road-mending, but not for ordinary work such as was contemplated in this instance.

MR. CALLAN was surprised that the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken, being an old Grand Juror of experience himself, should have made such a great mistake. He wished to point out to the Committee that the hon. Gentleman, through his agents, had made use of these powers to obtain these materials; and, therefore, he could not understand him objecting to the same powers being inserted in this Bill.

MR. TOTTENHAM explained that what he had said was that they had no power to take materials for building, although they had for road repairing.

MR. SEXTON said, he understood that that was so. All he wanted was that contractors, under this Bill, should have the same facilities for obtaining materials as they had under the Grand Juries.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, that the class of materials wanted was entirely different in these two cases. They wanted sand and stone for building, which they did not for road-making. He could not accept the Amendment.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR could not see why they should not have the same advantages for building these houses under this Bill as they had for other public work under the Grand Jury system.

Question put, and *negatived.*

COLONEL KING-HARMAN begged leave to move the following new Clause:—

.(Outdoor relief to terminate tenancy.)

"The sanitary authority shall not permit any person who may be in receipt of outdoor relief, other than medical relief, to remain in occupation of any houses which may be built or acquired by the sanitary authority under any of the provisions of this Act."

New Clause—(*Colonel King-Harman,*) —*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, that the existing law entirely met the case which this clause was intended to deal with.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

INFANTS BILL [*Lords*].—[BILL 157.]

(*Mr. Bryce.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. BRYCE said, this Bill was substantially the same measure which was debated at such great length last Session. It then went to the House of Lords; but their Lordships said they had not sufficient time to consider it, and consequently it had to be dropped for the year. It was, however, introduced afresh into the House of Lords at the beginning of the present Session, referred to, and considered by, a very strong Select Committee, which included Lord Selborne, the late Lord Cairns, Lord FitzGerald, and Lord Bramwell, and subsequently debated fully in the full House. It now came before the House as the result of much time and thought in both Houses —for the changes made in the House of Lords had not substantially affected it; and under those circumstances, and considering the lateness of the hour, he did not think the House would wish him to go into the details of the measure.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

MR. ONSLOW said, he had blocked this Bill right through, and it was only through inadvertence that he had allowed his block to lapse. He most strongly opposed it, because he thought it was a very wrong principle to give a wife the power of appointing guardians over her children during the lifetime of her husband, and for that reason he had done all in his power to prevent the passage of the Bill. He objected to a matter of such importance being brought on at so late an hour also. He hoped the House would not accept the second reading; and, therefore, he moved that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Debate be now adjourned." —(*Mr. Onslow.*)

The House *divided:*—Ayes 17; Noes 54: Majority 37.—(Div. List, No. 269.)

Original Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at five minutes after Five o'clock in the morning.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 4th August, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Expiring Laws Continuance* (229); Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers)* (231); Crown Lands* (224); Telegraph Acts Amendment (230).

Second Reading — Committee negatived — Third Reading — Registration Appeals (Ireland)* (226), and *passed.*

Report—Burgh Police and Health (Scotland)* (190); Evidence by Commission* (228).

Third Reading—Pluralities* (213); Customs and Inland Revenue (No. 2)* (220); Lunacy Acts Amendment* (221), and *passed.*

TELEGRAPH ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

(*The Lord Mount-Temple.*)

(NO. 230.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

LORD MOUNT-TEMPLE, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, that it would enable persons disposed to be laconic to communicate by telegraph at half the present cost. It would, therefore, confer a very considerable boon upon those persons who were now obliged to pay for 20 words when their messages contained less than 10 words. It was calculated that if the

Bill passed there would be a large increase in the number of messages sent; and there was no doubt that the measure would be a very great advantage to the public at large. The provisions of the Bill were very simple, but would be important to all classes of the community.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª."—(*The Lord Mount-Temple.*)

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, he could not quite understand how the Bill came to be in charge of the noble Lord opposite (Lord Mount-Temple). He would like to know from that whether the Government assented to the Bill; and also whether the 1st section meant that the name and address of the sender must be upon the message, as the name and address were now to be counted as parts of the 12 words allowed to be sent for 6*d.*?

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (The Earl of IDDESLEIGH) said, that the Bill was introduced into the Commons by the late Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre). When it came on for discussion, his (the Earl of Iddesleigh's) noble Friend the present Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) proposed that it should be carried with an Amendment respecting free addresses of which he had given Notice. His noble Friend was defeated upon that, and thereupon left his Predecessor to take charge of the Bill. So far as the Government were concerned, they looked upon the Bill as one for which the late Government were responsible.

LORD MOUNT-TEMPLE said, he was not like the noble Earl who asked the question (the Earl of Milltown), and who had pounced upon the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Bill against the wish of the promoters of the Bill—he had been requested by the late Postmaster General (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) to take charge of the Bill, and he had done so. Under its provisions the sum of 6*d.* was to be paid for any number of words not exceeding 12; and the sender might put them either in the address or in the message, sending as many or few as he desired in either.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, that in Committee he would move an Amendment in order to make the Bill more clear on the point raised by his question.

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—DELIMITATION OF THE FRONTIER.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH, in rising to ask the Prime Minister a Question as to the progress of the negotiations with the Russian Government regarding the delimitation of the Afghan Frontier, and especially as to the matter of the Zulfikar Pass and the position of Maruchak and Penjdeh; also, what are the terms of the agreement concluded between the Viceroy of India and the Ameer of Afghanistan at the Durbar at Rawul Pindi; whether those terms have been subjected to any modification or amendment by Her Majesty's present Government; and, whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to occupy the Pishin Valley or any other strategical positions within the dominions of the Ameer with a force of observation this autumn? said, he would not enter into any detailed remarks on that occasion, neither did he wish to press for any statement with regard to the negotiations which might in any way tend to complicate the situation, or be inconvenient as regards the interests of the public. But the Session was drawing to a close, and very great interest was felt throughout the country in the state of these negotiations. Some short time ago the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury) made a statement in the House, and it was clear as far as it went. As he (the Duke of Marlborough) understood it, the noble Marquess was not prepared to recommend any novel course. They had been informed that there was to be an arbitration, and that something was to be referred to somebody; but nothing was stated in a definite form, and now they were given to understand that that was to lapse, and that the only question was a delimitation of Frontier, which involved only a few miles of territory 500 miles from their Indian Possessions. The only question left in abeyance, which neither the late Government nor the present Government had communicated their opinion upon, was the most important of all—it was what was the agreement which was arrived at between the Viceroy of India and the Ameer as to the defence of Afghanistan? These questions in regard to the Frontier were of great importance, and the trade of the country was more or less influenced by the prolonged tension at which the public mind was being kept with respect to them; and he hoped the noble Marquess would be able to make some statement which would tend to relieve the public anxiety. In his opinion, it was perfectly useless for this country to enter into negotiations with the Government of Russia with regard to territory which was 500 miles from their Indian Frontier unless they were prepared to come to an agreement with the Ameer as to the means they were to have of overlooking and watching that Frontier. It had been stated that the subsidy to the Ameer had been increased to £250,000 annually. If they were to give so large a subsidy, there should be some clear understanding of what were to be their relative responsibilities. If there was to be a recurrence of disturbances on the delimitation of Frontier like those which had already occurred at Penjdeh, they could never tell at what moment this country might be drawn into European difficulties without having anyone but themselves to blame in the matter.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I will take the various heads of the noble Duke's Question in turn, and will give to them such answer as I can. In the first place, the noble Duke asks me—

> "As to the progress of the negotiations with the Russian Government regarding the delimitation of the Afghan Frontier, and especially as to the matter of the Zulfikar Pass and the position of Maruchak and Pendjeh?"

Maruchak remains with Afghanistan, and Penjdeh remains with Russia. So much was agreed to by the late Government, and nothing has been suggested on either side to disturb that agreement since. With respect to the Zulfikar Pass, I cannot say that matters are in a very different position from what they were when the present Government took Office. Our contention, as the noble Duke is aware, is that the Zulfikar Pass was promised to Afghanistan, and that, on the strength of that promise, the Viceroy of India promised the Ameer should have it. We held ourselves bound by that promise, and we hold Russia bound by that promise also. I can state exactly what our contention is, and have done so; but I do not feel it would be equally proper for me to state what the contention of Russia is in the matter; for, though it is easy to represent your own views in your own words, when you attempt to represent the contention of other persons, of the party with whom you are in controversy, it is possible that some words you may use may not represent as accurately as they would wish it to be represented the precise views that they take. I will only say, therefore, that they do not admit our contention in the matter. I do not know how soon I shall be able to lay Papers on the Table. I am very anxious to do so as soon as possible, because it will dissipate all misunderstanding, and make the position of the Government very much more satisfactory. But, of course, it is impossible to do so as long as by doing so we might in any way compromise the success of the negotiation. I may say that the delay at present is chiefly due to the desire of the Russian Government to obtain more information with respect to the matter on which the controversy turns. The noble Duke asks me, in the next place, what are the terms of the agreement concluded between the Viceroy of India and the Ameer of Afghanistan at the Durbar at Rawul Pindi? I do not think it would be desirable to publish the whole account of that interview, because foreign Potentates, and especially Potentates like the Ameer of Afghanistan, do not understand our Parliamentary ways, and might resent that that should be given to the world which they had spoken imagining it to be in perfect confidence. At the same time I can tell the noble Duke, what I have said before, that we distinctly agreed that the Ameer should have the Zulfikar Pass as a portion of the Afghan Frontier. The noble Duke proceeds to ask whether those terms have been subjected to any modification or amendment by Her Majesty's present Government? To that my answer is easy. They have been subjected to no modification or amendment whatever. The noble Duke also asks—

> "Whether it is the intention of Her Majesty's Government to occupy the Pishin Valley or any other strategical positions within the dominions of the Ameer with a force of observation this autumn?"

Well, this is a Question which it is

rather difficult to answer directly, because it contains some misapprehensions. We are already in occupation of the Pishin Valley, which is not a position within the Dominion of the Ameer, but belongs to the Crown of England. The Pishin Valley, as I have said, is occupied, and I dare say probably will be occupied, in greater force as time goes on. The noble Duke is well aware of the policy which was stated in the course of the somewhat remarkable debate which was started at the instance of the noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Argyll) some months ago, in which there was substantial agreement between both sides of the House as to the imperative necessity of strengthening our Indian Frontier. That policy, I believe, as the late Government understood it, as far as I know, we are pursuing as rapidly and as vigorously as we can. No ephemeral alteration in the diplomatic situation will induce us in any degree to relax or alter a policy which does not depend upon the transitory conditions of our relations with this or that Power, and which is absolutely necessary for the security of our Indian Empire, without reference to what other nations may be doing. We have no intention to occupy any strategic position in the Dominions of the Ameer with a force of observation during the present autumn. The Ameer is an independent Potentate, and of course we could not do such a thing without his permission; but, apart from that, there is no desire to do it at present. What might happen under certain contingencies in the future I will not say; I only can speak for the present, and there is no project of the kind in contemplation by the Indian Government.

EGYPT (THE SOUDAN)—THE FRIENDLY TRIBES.

QUESTION.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS asked, Whether, before Parliament separated, the noble Marquess would make a statement with reference to the Soudan, and particularly as to any steps to be taken for the protection of the tribes that had been friendly to us? The Question he had asked had reference to the Proclamation which had been issued by General Gordon promising protection to the friendlies.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I am afraid, to use a well-known phrase that "many things have happened" since General Gordon wrote those words. Whether there are any "friendlies" now in existence for us to protect is a matter on which I should not like to give any hasty assurance. I know that a great many friendlies were killed; and I think it probable that such as were not killed have ceased to be friendly. However that may be, no appeal has reached me from any tribes described as friendly who are now suffering danger in consequence of their conduct towards us. I quite recognize the responsibility which rests on this country with respect to vast masses of the population in consequence of what we did in the Soudan; but I am not aware that at present there is any call on Her Majesty's Government to take any steps for the protection of any peoples of that kind. I am afraid the time has passed when such protection could be given to anyone by England. With respect to the question of the Soudan generally, I will only say that it is a matter very specially belonging to the Mission on which my right hon. Friend Sir Drummond Wolff has started. It would not be for the public service or consistent with usage that I should state the recommendations which we shall have to make to the Sultan and others on this subject. But my noble Friend may be well assured that, after the immediate needs of Egyptian finance are happily disposed of, there is no subject which claims a more earnest attention on the part of Her Majesty's Government than that of the regions to which he referred.

THE NEW PUBLIC OFFICES—DESIGNS FOR THE NEW WAR OFFICE AND ADMIRALTY.—QUESTION.

In reply to the Earl of WEMYSS,

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (The Earl of IDDESLEIGH) said, that he would communicate with the First Commissioner of Works, in order to see whether some arrangement could not be made for placing the models of the new War and Admiralty Offices, now being exhibited in the Victoria Gallery, in some place where they could be inspected by architects and others interested in the matter.

House adjourned at Five o'clock, till To-morrow, Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 4th August, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—Registration Appeals (Ireland) * [259].

Second Reading — Land Purchase (Ireland) [249].

Committee — *Report* — Federal Council of Australasia [165]; Secretary for Scotland [242]; Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment [250-258].

Considered as amended—Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) * [233]; East India (Army Pensions Deficiency) * [225].

Considered as amended—Re-comm.—Committee—Report — Considered as amended — Third Reading—Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2) [68], and *passed.*

Third Reading—Earldom of Mar Restitution * [256]; Public Works Loans * [254], and *passed.*

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

SUNDERLAND CORPORATION BILL (*by Order*).

CONSIDERATION OF LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Lords' Amendments *considered.*

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, he had an Amendment to move which he did not believe would be opposed.

Amendment proposed,

In Clause 36a, leave out from "person," in the first line of the Clause, to the end of the Clause, in order to insert the following words, "except with the consent of the Corporation to erect or build, or to begin to erect or build, any new building abutting upon any new street or part of a new street unless the Corporation shall have previously approved of the level and available width of such new street or part of a new street, nor until the carriage-way and footway of such new street or part of a new street shall have been formed to such a level and of such a width and constructed and sewered to the satisfaction of the Corporation, in accordance with section one hundred and fifty of 'The Public Health Act, 1875;' and any person offending against this enactment shall be liable for each offence to a penalty not exceeding twenty pounds."—(*Mr. Arthur Arnold.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES (Sir ARTHUR OTWAY) said, he had no objection to the Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Lords' Amendments, as amended, *agreed to.*

RAMSDEN ESTATE BILL [*Lords*] (*by Order*).

THIRD READING DEFERRED.

Order for Third Reading read.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES said, he wished to make an appeal to his hon. Friend the Member for Salford (Mr. Arthur Arnold), who had given Notice of his intention to move the re-committal of the Bill with respect to Clause 5, to state his objections to the clause at once, rather than defer the third reading until another day. He made the appeal on account of the short time now left for the disposal of Private Bills. He was quite prepared to answer any objection his hon. Friend might make.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, he should be most happy to adopt the suggestion of his right hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means; and he would at once, in a very few words, explain the reasons which had induced him to place an Amendment on the Paper. It would be in the recollection of hon. Members that last year the House, on his Motion, unanimously adopted a Standing Order with regard to Estate Bills, which provided that the Committee should specially report to the House any case in which a Bill contained a provision extending the term or area of land in settlement. It further provided that such Report should be printed and circulated with the Votes. The Committee on the Ramsden Estate Bill had, in pursuance of that Standing Order, made a Report to the House, and he was obliged to call attention for a moment to the nature of that Report, because the Committee over which his right hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means had presided had done their best in the interests of the passing of the Bill to attenuate the requirements of the Standing Order. Under a Private Act of 1867, the Trustees of the Ramsden Settled Estates obtained power to expend £50,000 in the purchase of hereditaments in the neighbourhood of the family estates at Byram in Yorkshire. It was proposed by the Bill now before the House to vary that power of settlement, and to ask the sanction of the House to expend the sum of £50,000—the same sum authorized in 1867 to be expended in land at Byram—upon property in the neighbourhood of the town of Huddersfield. Although his right hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means, in reporting on the Bill, called attention to that fact, he suggested that although, under the Standing Order, a Report had been rendered necessary, still there would not be, under the provisions of the Bill, any real extension of the area of settled land, because the price of land was higher in the neighbourhood of Huddersfield than it was in the neighbourhood of Byram; and, therefore, £50,000 expended in the neighbourhood of Huddersfield would purchase less land than at Byram, and consequently there would be no extension of the area of settled land. He thought he could dispose of that contention by simply pointing out that the Chairman of Ways and Means had felt it his duty, and the House was certainly indebted to him for it, to report the Bill to the House, as coming within the Standing Order. The plain matter of fact was this—that the House of Commons was asked, at that moment, to sanction the expenditure of a sum of £50,000 in the purchase of property to be added to the settled land of the Ramsden estates—that was to say, that land, now free land, in the neighbourhood of the town of Huddersfield was to be purchased in order to be converted into settled land. He was glad that he had nothing of a personal character to say in regard to the Bill, except that he had every reason to believe that his hon. Friend the Member for the Eastern Division of the West Riding of Yorkshire (Sir John Ramsden), to whom the Bill specially referred, was an excellent landlord, as he was certainly a valuable Member of Parliament. But if there was any case in which the House would be disposed to object to the settlement of land, it was in the neighbourhood of Huddersfield, because there was no town in the Kingdom more close in regard to settled land than that borough. He believed that the Ramsden estate extended over the whole, or practically the whole, of that town. In such a state of things, he did not think it was desirable, in the interests of the people of this country generally, that the system should be extended, and he hoped that every hon. Member who was interested in land reform would oppose the Bill.

Mr. WARTON asked why the system of settling land should not be extended?

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, his reason for objecting to the extension of the system was that it was opposed to the interests of the people; and it was for that reason that he proposed to ask the House to consent to the re-committal of the Bill, in order that Clause 5 might be struck out. In doing so, he could not refrain from renewing the expression of his gratitude to the House for having passed the Standing Order, nor could he refrain from reminding the House that this was probably the first occasion in the history of Parliament in which the practice of settling land had been brought up at the Bar of the House of Commons by the responsible officials of the House as a practice which was contrary to the public interests. He was delighted that that occasion should have occurred; and, as he had already said, he hoped that all those who took any interest in land reform, in regard to which this question of settlement formed the key-stone, would give him their support in resisting the provision of the present Bill, and in asking the House to re-commit the measure in order that Clause 5 might be struck out.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect to Clause 5."—(*Mr. Arthur Arnold.*)

The CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES rose to address the House, when——

Mr. SPEAKER interposed. He said that the action taken by the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arthur Arnold) was in the nature of opposition, and therefore the Bill must stand over until to-morrow.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, his right hon. Friend the Chairman of Ways and Means had appealed to him to go on.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Member has made a hostile Motion to the Bill, and it is therefore necessary that the discussion should stand over until to-morrow.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD: I certainly cannot withdraw the Motion.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time *To-morrow.*

QUESTIONS.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—LONDON BOARD SCHOODS—ANNUAL COST PER SCHOLAR.

Lord ALGERNON PERCY asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, What has been the cost per scholar in the London Board Schools during the past three years, and what is the estimated cost per scholar for the coming financial year?

The VICE PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL (Mr. E. Stanhope): Sir, the Clerk of the London School Board sends me the following figures in reply to my noble Friend's Question:—The expenditure per scholar in average attendance in the London Board Schools was, for the year ending August 13, 1882, £2 16*s.* 5¼*d.*; for 1883, £2 15*s.* 3¾*d.*; for 1884, £2 14*s.* 6*d.* But the estimated expenditure for the year ending March 25, 1885, is £2 17*s.* 1*d.*, and for that ending March 25, 1886, £3 1*s.* 1*d.*; showing an increase in the three years of 4*s.* 7¾*d.* per scholar. These figures corroborate the statement made by my noble Friend in the recent debate on the Education Estimates.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—LURGAN UNION—DR. JOHN SCOTT.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he is aware that a Doctor Scott acts as elected guardian of Lurgan Union, and also dispensary doctor for a district within the Union; and, whether such conduct is regular; and, if not, will he have it remedied?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): I think there must be some misunderstanding in this matter. It appears there is a Doctor John Scott who is an elected Guardian of this Union, and a Doctor Francis Scott, who is medical officer of one of the dispensing districts of the Union. The former is not acting as a medical officer in the Union.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—PETTY SESSIONS CLERK, MULLAGHROE PETTY SESSIONS DISTRICT, CO. SLIGO.

Mr. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, With reference to a memorial addressed to his predecessor, pointing out the great inconvenience caused to the inhabitants of the Mullaghroe (county Sligo) Petty Sessions District by the fact that the petty sessions clerk lives sixteen miles away from some parts of the district, at Boyle, in another county, whether the Government are aware that the official in question holds the clerkships of five petty sessions districts; and, whether, in compliance with the desire conveyed in the memorial, they will cause to be appointed to the clerkship of Mullaghroe a person resident in the district?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): The subject of this Memorial has been very carefully considered, and the Government are satisfied that no sufficient cause has been shown for making any change at present in the existing arrangement.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—PROTECTION POST AT BUNDUFF, CO. LEITRIM.

Mr. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the police protection post at Bunduff, county Sligo, is in the house of an evicted tenant, and what rent is paid by the Government for the house to the landlord, Captain Barton; whether there are five constabulary barracks within a radius of three miles from this protection post; and, whether the district is quite orderly and entirely free from crime; and, if so, whether the post will be discontinued?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): Hitherto for some time past there has been a temporary protection post at Bunduff—which is in the county of Leitrim, and not Sligo—in a house belonging to Captain Barton, for which no rent has been paid. It has now, however, been decided to re-arrange the police districts of the locality, and to make Bunduff an ordinary permanent station. There are only two other stations within a radius of three miles, and one of these is in the next county. The force at the protection post has not been charged to the locality.

THE IRISH ADMINISTRATION—MR. E. G. JENKINSON.

Mr. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether there is any intention on the part of the Government to appoint Mr. E. G. Jenkinson to the post of Assistant Under Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, or in any way to continue, or renew, the connection of that official with the administration of Ireland?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): Mr. Jenkinson still holds the post to which the hon. Member asks if it is the intention of the Government to appoint him. I am not in a position to say what his tenure of the office will be; but it is distinctly temporary.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (IRELAND) — THE CLERK TO THE BANGOR TOWN COMMISSIONERS.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Did the Local Government Board write to the Bangor Town Commissioners, about the beginning of June last, to take into consideration the advisability of removing the town clerk; did the Commissioners, in consequence, reply that the clerk had been called upon to resign; has the same person been reinstated as clerk; and, can he be retained in face of the recent disclosures concerning him made by several of the Commissioners before Mr. Justice O'Brien at the Belfast Assizes?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): It appears that, at the instance of the Local Government Board, the Bangor Town Commissioners recently called on their clerk to resign, and that subsequently they declined to accept his resignation. I am informed that they took this course in consequence of the receipt of a Memorial signed by the principal ratepayers asking them to retain the clerk. The Local Government Board have no power to appoint or remove a Town Clerk.

MARRIAGE LAW—ATTENDANCE OF REGISTRARS.

MR. ATKINSON asked Mr. Attorney General, If he will bring in a Bill to dispense with the personal attendance of Registrars at marriages celebrated in places of public worship licensed for the due solemnization of such marriages, care being taken to provide, under penalties, for their proper registration?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER): Sir, according to the existing law the personal attendance of the Registrar makes the registration sufficient evidence of the contract of marriage, assuming the requirements of the Acts have been observed. It is most important that proper evidence of marriages should be preserved in as simple a form as possible; but, although I cannot pledge myself to bring in a Bill, I am quite willing to consult the proper authorities as to whether, assuming a valid registration can be secured without the presence of the Registrar, his attendance might be dispensed with.

EGYPT (THE SOUDAN)—THE LATE EXPEDITION UNDER HICKS PASHA —CASE OF THE LATE E. B. EVANS, INTERPRETER.

MR. CALLAN (for Mr. MARUM) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether his attention has been called to the case of the late Edward Baldwin Evans, Interpreter to the Expedition under Hicks Pasha, and who was killed therein together with that General officer; whether, having lived for many years in Alexandria, Cairo, and Hedjaz, and carried Despatches from the Consul there to Suez, he (E. B. Evans) found the Indian Contingent on its way to the front, and was engaged in the Intelligence Department with the honorary rank of Captain and pay at the rate of £400 per annum; that he was at Tel-el-Kebir, and afterwards was employed as Interpreter for Mr. Broadly in the Egyptian State Trials; that he received his Commission from the Khedive; that, after the Battle of Marabia, his rank was raised to that of Major with pay of £500; that for his valuable services he was promised by the Egyptian Government a gratuity of six months' pay; whether, notwithstanding no such gratuity has been paid to his sisters, who were dependent on him for support, and who are now in straitened circumstances, there is still outstanding an arrear of two months' pay that accrued due before the fate of the Expedition; and, whether the Government will use its influence to see right done?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. BOURKE): There is no information in the Foreign Office regarding this case; but inquiry will be made as to what are the facts.

ARMY—SMALL ARM AMMUNITION—THE BOXER CARTRIDGE.

MR. LABOUCHERE asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is a fact that the ammunition for the Martini-Henry rifle was not adopted until upwards of a year after General Boxer had retired from the Service, and that he is in no way responsible or to blame for any defects in the construction of the cartridge which may have been the cause of failure with respect to strength-resistance to wet and damp, and easy extraction under severe service conditions; and, whether it is a fact that the cartridge for the Snider rifle, for the construction of which General Boxer is wholly responsible, has successfully stood the unerring test of nearly twenty years' experience, in peace and in war, and that, too, under conditions as unfavourable to its proper action as those under which failures are reported to have occurred with the Martini-Henry ammunition?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): The facts as to the introduction of the Martini-Henry rifle cartridge are, substantially, as stated by the hon. Member. As regards comparison between the Martini-Henry and the Snider cartridge, I must decline to be led into any discussion as to their respective merits.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—TAMPERING WITH LETTERS.

MR. CALLAN (for Mr. MARUM) asked the Postmaster General, Whether his attention has been directed to an alleged irregularity in the transit, through the postal officials, of two letters posted in Dublin on the 10th of June last, and addressed to John Lowry, Esq., Post Office, Ballybrophy, in the Queen's County, Ireland, wherein those letters have been tampered with, and that the writer of the letters in question has proposed to the postal authorities in Dublin to prove on oath the alleged tampering with the documents furnished to them; and, whether he will cause an inquiry to be instituted under which the writer may be enabled to make good the above charge?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord JOHN MANNERS): My attention has been called to the case alluded to by the hon. Member. Very careful inquiry has already been made, and I see no reason whatever for coming to any other conclusion than that already stated to Mr. Lowry—namely, that the letters were not tampered with while in the hands of the Post Office. I, therefore, see no reason to hold the inquiry suggested.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS—THE CHARITY COMMISSIONERS—TONBRIDGE SCHOOL.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether the Charity Commissioners, in their draft scheme for Tonbridge School, proposed that a second or middle school should be established in or near the town of Tonbridge; whether the Skinners' Company provided an endowment fund of £20,000 for the purpose of establishing such school; whether the Charity Commissioners, after obtaining possession of this money, insisted that the promised new school should be placed at Tunbridge Wells, a town five miles distant from Tonbridge; whether this proceeding on the part of the Charity Commissioners is in violation of their statutory powers; and, whether, pending the inquiry to be made by the Select Committee into the working of the Endowed Schools Act, the Charity Commissioners will postpone the expenditure of the said endowment fund, in order that the grave charges brought by the inhabitants of Tonbridge against the action of the Commissioners in respect to this school might be inquired into?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Mr. E. STANHOPE): In the year 1875 the Charity Commissioners published a draft scheme for Sir Andrew Judd's School at Tonbridge, providing, among other things, for the investment of the residuary income of that endowment as a fund for the ultimate establishment of a middle school "in or near the town of Tonbridge." In the year 1878 a fresh draft scheme was published for Sir Andrew Judd's School, from which the former provision for the establishment of a middle school "in or near the town of Tonbridge" was omitted. At the same time another draft scheme was published for the application of a sum of

£20,000, to be provided from sources independent of Sir Andrew Judd's School by the Skinner's Company, and wholly unconnected with Tonbridge, for a middle school to be maintained "in or near the parish of Tonbridge," leaving open the position of the school, at the express desire of the Skinners' Company. The scheme for the middle school in the form agreed to by the Skinners' Company having, in due course, been approved by Her Majesty, the Charity Commissioners received representations both from Tonbridge and from Tunbridge Wells, in both of which towns sites for the new school were offered. After inquiry and full consideration of the circumstances, the Charity Commissioners arrived at the conclusion that, however desirable it might be that a second or lower school should be established in the town of Tonbridge, the reasons in favour of placing the middle school at Tunbridge Wells preponderated. The approval of the site for the school was expressly reserved to the Charity Commissioners in the scheme as approved by Her Majesty, and a suitable site for the school at Tunbridge Wells has now been secured by voluntary gift from the inhabitants.

INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—THE KILKEE DRAINAGE.

The O'GORMAN MAHON asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Irish Government are aware that great damage has been and is being caused by the overflow of swamps, and the consequent flooding of agricultural and pastoral lands in the district of Kilkee, County Clare; and, whether the Government will immediately cause the Board of Works to institute a competent inquiry, with a view to ascertain the nature and extent of the damage, and to decide whether the State can aid the occupiers of the district in executing drainage operations?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Sir Henry Holland) said, he must ask that the Question should be postponed until Thursday. He had not yet received a communication in reference to it in answer to his inquiries.

PARLIAMENTARY ELECTIONS—USE OF NATIONAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL ROOMS.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, If, in view of the coming elections, he will address a Memorandum to the managers of National Elementary Schools, especially to those in rural districts, pointing out that, in all cases where the use of the public school rooms is granted for political and other public purposes, there should be no preference given to any one political section of the inhabitants of the district?

The VICE PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL (Mr. E. Stanhope): Although, personally, I am of opinion that, as a rule, it is desirable in these cases that both political Parties should be treated on an equality, it is impossible to say that it is of universal application, and I cannot undertake to interfere with the discretion of the school managers in the manner suggested by the hon. Member.

ALLOTMENTS EXTENSION ACT, 1882—LADY ISABELLA DODD'S CHARITY, ELLESBOROUGH, BUCKS.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether the Charity Commissioners prepared and circulated, in August 1884, a draft scheme relating to Lady Isabella Dodd's Charity, in Ellesborough, Bucks., which omitted provisions for allotments, and whether the Charity Commissioners have since inserted provisions for allotments therein in accordance with section fourteen of "The Allotments Extension Act, 1882;" whether the Charity Commissioners have inserted provisions for allotments, as required by section fourteen of "The Allotments Extension Act, 1882," in all schemes made by them after the passing of that Act in relation to any Charity, part of the endowment of which consisted of land (other than buildings and the appurtenances of buildings); whether, if they have omitted to insert such provisions in any such schemes, they will repair the omission by issuing amended schemes which will contain provisions for allotments according to the intention of the Act; and, whether the Charity Commissioners will publish a list of the schemes made by them since the passing of the said Act in which such provisions are inserted, and a list of those which contain no such provisions?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Mr. E. STANHOPE): To the first part of the Question of the hon. Member I have to say that the facts are correctly stated. To the second, the Charity Commissioners inform me that these provisions have in some cases been omitted, partly from inadvertence (chiefly in the case of schemes drafted previously to and established shortly after the passing of the Allotments Act, 1882), and partly because it was for some time doubted whether these provisions should not be inserted only in schemes in which provision is made for the management of the lands of the charity. They are now always inserted in such cases. To the third part, the answer is that schemes can be made only on application to the Commissioners, who have no power to act on their own motion. They authorize me to say that if application is made in any of these cases they will be quite ready to insert these provisions. For this reason, and because the Return would be costly and practically useless, I have to answer the hon. Member's fourth paragraph in the negative.

POST OFFICE (CONTRACTS)—THE AMERICAN MAIL SERVICE.

MR. GILES asked the Postmaster General, In what direction the extension of the American Mail Service will take place, seeing that an increase of £25,775 has been made in the Estimates; and, whether any provision has been made for despatching a Thursday's mail to America by the express steamers of the North German Lloyd from Southampton?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord JOHN MANNERS): The increase referred to by my hon. Friend is due mainly to the normal growth annually of the correspondence sent from this country to the United States. An increase of the correspondence does not necessarily call for an extension of the American mail service; and I may state that, until the whole question has been fully considered, it is not intended to make any provision, beyond that which now exists in the shape of ship letter mails, for sending the Thursday's mails to America by the steamers of the North German Lloyd from Southampton.

WESTERN PACIFIC—NEW GUINEA—FORM OF GOVERNMENT FOR THE ENGLISH PORTION.

VISCOUNT LYMINGTON asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether Her Majesty's Government have decided upon the form of Government under which the English portion of New Guinea is to be administered; upon the proportion of the expense of government to be borne by the Imperial Exchequer; and upon efficient means of permanently securing the yearly contributions of the Colonial Parliaments?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Colonel STANLEY), in reply, said, he was not in a position to make any definite statement. The proceedings which had taken place between Her Majesty's Government and the Colonial authorities in respect of New Guinea had been somewhat interrupted by the change of Government. The various arrangements were not yet concluded.

MR. BRYCE: Will the right hon. and gallant Gentleman be able to do so within the next few days?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE: I am afraid not.

TRAMWAY COMPANIES (METROPOLIS)—EMPLOYES HOURS OF LABOUR.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If the attention of the Government has been called to the condition of labour imposed on the London tram men; if he is aware that they are compelled to work sixteen hours a-day, including Sundays; and, whether he will grant an inquiry into the subject?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): Yes, Sir; I have made inquiries, and I believe these men very often have to work 16 hours a-day. It seems to me enormous labour, as the House can understand, for we are ourselves working 16 hours a-day. We were so yesterday.

THE CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT—THE SUFFOLK CONSERVATIVE ASSOCIATION.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether his attention has been called to a Circular issued and signed by the Marquis of Bristol as Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Stowmarket Division of the Suffolk Conservative Association, in which Circular the following paragraph appears :—

> "As under the Corrupt Practices Act the candidate is allowed to spend only a limited sum of money upon election expenses, the Association will be put to some expense in holding meetings, publishing pamphlets, &c. with a view to assist the return of a Conservative to represent the Division in Parliament, this Association will also require funds for its own organization ;"

and, whether the expenditure by an Association "with a view to assist the return of a candidate," beyond the sum authorised by the Corrupt Practices Act, is legal within the provisions of that Act?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER): Sir, it is impossible to answer the Question of the hon. Member in the terms in which it is framed. The provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act do not interfere with *bonâ fide* organizations or expenses *bonâ fide* incurred by political associations for the promotion of particular political views in any constituency without reference to the election of any particular individual. Whether or not the expenditure of an association is illegal is a question of fact, and can only be finally determined by the Election Court after the investigation of all the circumstances of the case.

PUBLIC WORKS (IRELAND)—DEDUCTIONS FROM ROAD CONTRACTORS' ACCOUNTS—MR. F. MORRIS, SECRETARY TO GRAND JURY, CO. CLARE.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether Francis Morris, Secretary of the Grand Jury of the county Clare, has been for a number of years in the habit of charging road contractors a fee of 2*s.* 6*d.* each for form of tender when applying for contracts for public works, and a fee of 4*s.* for what he terms "accounting" on getting their half-yearly payments of account; whether he has admitted, when questioned by Mr. Anthony O'Dwyer, a cesspayer, at the Presentment Sessions held at Multown Mulbury in May last, that these charges were illegal, and ought not to have been made; whether he, notwithstanding, extracted the fees as usual from contractors when settling their accounts after the last assizes; and, whether any proceedings will be instituted against Morris?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): I have already explained that the Secretary of a Grand Jury is not an officer of the Government, and that, therefore, the question of charges by him is not a matter for Parliamentary interference.

LAW AND POLICE—ILLEGAL FISHING IN KILDARE—INSANITARY HOUSES AT KILL.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the constabulary at Kill, county Kildare, have reported that Lord Mayo, and members of his family and servants, have repeatedly dragged the canal with large nets for fish, which when taken are conveyed to fish ponds in Lord Mayo's demesne in Palmerston, and whether a prosecution will be instituted; and, whether the houses in the village of Kill, on Lord Mayo's property, were two years ago condemned as unfit for human habitation by the late medical officer, Dr. Hayes; and, if so, who is responsible for the failure to enforce the law?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE), in reply, said, the police had not made any Report on this matter, nor were they aware that such a thing had taken place. He was informed that, at Kill, houses held under leases were condemned as unfit for human habitation, and the sanitary officer stated that action was duly taken in the matter.

ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—PROMOTION OF HEAD CONSTABLES.

MR. BERESFORD asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the giving of merely one appointment, after a period of nearly three years, is expected to satisfy the aspirations of the Head Constables of the Royal Irish Constabulary to their fair share of promotion to District Inspectorships; and, if not, will they get a proportion of vacancies which they claim as due to them without further delay?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): I recently explained that the regulated proportion of appointments of head constables to District Inspectorships has been and will be strictly kept up, and that the one appointment now about to be made is really in anticipation of what the head constables are entitled to. This concession has been made in consideration of the fact that, owing to unusual and unavoidable circumstances, 10 head constables were promoted in 1882, and that, consequently, a long time has elapsed since a promotion from that rank has taken place. Two further appointments will be given to head constables in due course.

PARKS (METROPOLIS)—THE REGENT'S PARK—RE-ENCLOSURE OF LAND.

MR. DANIEL GRANT asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether his attention has been drawn to a statement in *The Echo* of Saturday last, that a portion of the land in Regent's Park, lately restored to the public, has been again enclosed; and, whether such statement is correct; and, if so, what steps he proposes to take in the matter?

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. PLUNKET) asked that the Question should be again put in a day or two, when he would be in a position to answer it.

RAILWAYS (ENGLAND AND WALES)—TERMINAL CHARGES.

MR. NORWOOD asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether the attention of his Department has been directed to the decision of the Divisional Court in the case of Hall *v.* London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway, practically reversing the decisions for several years past of the Railway Commissioners in reference to terminal charges; and, whether, in view of the great importance of this decision to the trading community, the Government will, during the Recess, prepare a comprehensive measure dealing with the question?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS): Yes, Sir; the attention of the Board of Trade has been directed to the decision of the Queen's Bench Division of the High Court of Justice in the case of Hall *v.* the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway Company with reference to terminal charges; but I am not at the present moment in a position to give any pledge as to what course the Government may take with regard to railway legislation. The question is one of very great importance, and will receive the earnest attention of the Board of Trade.

TRADE AND NAVIGATION ACCOUNTS—IMPORTATION OF CATTLE, &c. FROM IRELAND.

MR. DUCKHAM asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether he will for the future add to the Monthly Trade and Navigation Accounts a Return of the numbers of cattle, sheep, and swine received from Ireland, similar to the Return of importations of those animals from Foreign Countries; and, whether he will add a Return of the dead meat of all kinds received from Ireland?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS): The accounts of the cattle exports from Ireland to Great Britain are obtained by the Veterinary Department of the Privy Council for Ireland, and are published weekly in *The Dublin Gazette*, and also yearly in the Veterinary Report of the Privy Council Office, London. Meat exports from Ireland are not so registered, and are, therefore, only treated as part of the coasting trade of the United Kingdom, which is not registered with the same formalities as the foreign trade. The monthly trade accounts have reference only to foreign and Colonial trade, and not to trade between separate divisions of the UnitedKingdom; but in view of the importance of information as to trade with Ireland the question will be carefully considered, with a view of including in such accounts a supplementary statement of trade with Ireland.

MR. NEWDEGATE asked, whether, in any future arrangement, the importation from Ireland would be kept separate from the importation of foreign and Colonial cattle?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD: I propose in future that a supplementary account dealing exclusively with Ireland shall be kept.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS—RETURN OF OCCUPIERS—ENGLAND AND WALES.

Mr. WOODALL asked the Under Secretary of State for the Home Department, When the Return of Male and Female Occupiers in England and Wales, presented on the 15th of June, and ordered to be printed on the 9th of July, will be distributed among Members of the House?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Stuart-Wortley): The Return has been with the printer since the order for printing was made. The proofs have been received in the Home Office this morning, and the Return will no doubt be ready for distribution in the course of a few days.

CONSTITUTION OF THE ADMIRALTY —A FINANCE LORD.

Sir JOHN HAY (for Lord Henry Lennox) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, Whether he has further considered the advisability of appointing a Finance Lord of the Board of Admiralty; whether he can explain the precise method of controlling expenditure which actually exists at the Admiralty at the present time; and, if it be true, as recently stated in evidence by the Accountant General of the Navy before the Committee now sitting on Admiralty Accounts, that there is now no permanent official at the Admiralty who is responsible for the control of the entire expenditure, but that each head of a department controls the expenditure of that Department?

The FIRST LORD (Lord George Hamilton): I have nothing to add to the objections I stated the other day to the appointment of a Finance Lord at the Board of Admiralty, and to them I still adhere. The method of controlling the expenditure at the Admiralty is the same as it has been for some years past. The ultimate control of the Naval Votes rests entirely with the Board of Admiralty, the Parliamentary Secretary being specially charged with this duty. The officers responsible to the Board for the expenditure out of these Votes are the heads of the spending Departments, who send in their statements of expenditure incurred to the Accountant General, who forwards their reports to the Secretary and First Lord of the Admiralty. I have not read the evidence of the Accountant General of the Navy before the Select Committee referred to; but he informs me that he gave the evidence with the object of making clear the different position which he, as Accountant General of the Navy, occupied to that of the Accountant General at the War Office, where that officer has authority to investigate proposed expenditure before it is incurred. At the Admiralty, the practice is to report to him the expenditure after it has been incurred. I have always assumed that the object for which the two offices were made was identical, and that as the War Office system has worked well we should endeavour, as far as possible, to assimilate to it the Admiralty system.

Mr. GRAY: Will the noble Lord be prepared to give the House any assurance that no permanent change involving additional expense will be made pending the consideration by the House of the Report of the Select Committee on Admiralty Accounts?

The FIRST LORD: It is competent to the hon. Member to discuss the Report of the Committee; but, in the present condition of Public Business, it would be impossible for the Government to initiate any such discussion. I cannot give the promise asked for by the hon. Member, as it will be our duty to take action upon that Report, subject to any opinion which the House may express on the Report; but if it be necessary to strengthen the financial control at the Admiralty by appointing any additional officers, of course it will be our duty to undertake this on our own responsibility.

NAVY—ACCOUNTANT GENERAL OF THE NAVY.

Sir JOHN HAY (for Lord Henry Lennox) asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, On what facts he based his statement to the effect that the Accountant General of the Navy is at the present time the only permanent official charged with the duty of checking and controlling the expenditure; and, whether it is intended to ask the Accountant General of the Navy (who has but recently returned from taking an important part in the Financial Control of Egypt) to undertake the absolute and entire Financial Control of the whole expenditure of the Navy?

The FIRST LORD (Lord George Hamilton): I made the statement in question because I believed it to be correct, and nothing has since occurred to contradict the opinion I then expressed. The Report of the Committee appointed to inquire into the recent excess of expenditure has not yet been circulated; and until I have had an opportunity of reading and considering it I cannot state the nature or scope of the alterations we may make, though one of them will be the strengthening of the authority and controlling power of the Accountant General.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—INSTRUCTION OF DEAF-MUTE CHILDREN.

Mr. WOODALL asked the Vice President of the Council, If he is aware that, of the large number of deaf-mute children in the United Kingdom, less than one-half are under suitable instruction; that, while State aid is given towards the education of the children of the criminal classes as well as of the general population, no Government help is afforded to the deaf and dumb; and, whether the Government will arrange for an inquiry into the subject by Royal Commission, as has been done in relation to the blind, and in accordance with what is understood to have been the intention of the late Government, as intimated in the reply of the late Vice President to the question addressed to him on the 18th of May last?

The VICE PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL (Mr. E. Stanhope): To ascertain the number of deaf-mute children not under suitable instruction is one of the objects of the inquiry which, as I stated the other day, we desired to institute. There is at present no reliable information on this point. It is true that no Government aid is at present given towards the instruction of the deaf and dumb; but I cannot say whether England stands alone among civilized countries in this respect. What the intention of the late Government may have been we have no means of knowing; but there is no trace of any resolution to extend to the deaf and dumb the inquiries of the Royal Commission on the condition of the blind. After carefully considering the matter, I am still of opinion that the inquiry already proposed affords, upon the whole, the means best calculated to advance the object which we all have at heart.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT — LONDON SCHOOL BOARD EXPENDITURE.

Mr. J. G. TALBOT asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether his attention has been called to the Report of the Finance Committee of the London School Board, from which it appears that the current account of that Board was, at the present moment, overdrawn to the amount of £130,000, and further that, after the receipt of all the precepts due at Michaelmas next, the account would still be overdrawn about £38,000; whether he could state to the House the causes which have led to this result; and, whether Her Majesty's Government intend to take any steps to prevent the recurrence of such a breach of duty?

The VICE PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL (Mr. E. Stanhope): I have asked the London School Board to furnish me with a reply to the Question of the hon. Member, and I have received from them the following:—At the date of the Report of the Finance Committee (July 28) the current account—including cheques to be drawn on the 30th of July—was overdrawn to the amount of £159,941. The Board would have to borrow this amount for a short time from their balance on capital account, which on the 30th of July amounted to £230,884. The current account would not have been overdrawn but for the fact that precepts to the amount of £219,196 which were due on the 24th of June previous had not up to the 30th of July been paid by the vestries and district boards. The statement that, after the receipt of all the precepts due at Michaelmas next, the current account would still be overdrawn by about £38,000, is due to a misapprehension. The statement should have been that on the 8th of October next the current account would still be overdrawn to the extent of £38,000, or perhaps £40,000, supposing all the precepts due at Midsummer last to have been then paid. But at Michaelmas next precepts to the amount of £261,341 will become due, and payments will at once begin to be made to the Board. This statement appears to me to be extremely unsatisfactory. The School Board appear to be applying money which they have borrowed from the Metropolitan Board of Works for a specific purpose to balance a deficit on the current account. But the Government have no power to interfere in any way.

EGYPT (MILITARY EXPEDITION)—THE SOUDAN—BATTLE OF ABU KLEA.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether any Despatch was received from Sir Herbert Stewart, giving an account of the Battle of Abu Klea, and the conduct of the Troops subsequent to the Despatch from Abu Klea of the 13th of January; and, if there be such a Despatch, whether he will lay it upon the Table of the House?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): I assume that the date in the hon. and gallant Baronet's Question is a misprint for the 18th of January, the date of the despatch referred to in my reply of yesterday. So far as I am aware there was no later despatch from Sir Herbert Stewart, who received his fatal wound early on the following day.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) ACT—PUBLICATION OF LISTS OF VOTERS IN NORTH ANTRIM.

MR. SEXTON asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, in view of the facts that the list of voters required by law to be published by the 22nd ult. did not reach the clerks of unions in North Antrim until the 29th; that the lists had not been published in the Grange District (county Sligo) on the 1st inst.; that complaints of similar failures of duty on the part of officials are made from different parts of Ireland; and that the period limited by statute for lodgment of claims expires to-day, What steps will be taken to impose upon officials responsible for violation of the duty cast upon them by law the penalties they have incurred; and, as voters and claimants have been deprived of the facilities contemplated by law for inspection of the lists, whether the provision in the Irish Registration Act is to be understood as applying to the lodgment of claims to be placed upon the register, and for what period beyond the present date claims may be lodged accordingly?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): I have not been able to ascertain whether the dates mentioned in the Question are correct; but I am aware in some places in Ireland the lists of voters were not published till after the time appointed by the statute. In any instances of the kind that have hitherto come to the notice of the Irish Government, it has, I think, been ascertained that this has not arisen from any failure of duty on the part of the officials, but from the impossibility of having the necessary printing completed in the short time at their disposal. Under such circumstances it would be unjust to seek to enforce penalties. There is no power to extend the time for lodging claims beyond the 4th August.

CHILI AND PERU—THE PERUVIAN BONDHOLDERS.

MR. WILLIAMSON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the proposed action of Her Majesty's Government, in concert with other Powers, referred to in the letter of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, dated the 28th July, addressed to the Chairman of the Peruvian Bondholders, has originated with Her Majesty's Government, or has been first suggested by any of these Powers; whether, in the Note of the Chilian Government of the 5th June 1884, therein referred to, that Government clearly indicated that the investigation of any claims arising from the acquisition by Chili of the Desert of Tarapaca should be, in the first instance, before the tribunals of Chili, in the form prescribed by Law; and, whether, seeing that there are several groups of Peruvian creditors who allege that they have claims against the guano deposits, and who have not united in submitting these claims to the Government of Chili since the 5th June 1884, nor have taken any steps to have the alleged hypothecation of territory, or of guano deposits thereon, investigated by the only competent tribunals, namely, those of Chili, Her Majesty's Government will consider whether it is not premature, at present, to press the alleged claims of anyone section of these creditors, in view of our friendly relations with the Chilian Government?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. BOURKE): I cannot reply at such short notice to the various points raised by the hon. Member, some of which involve questions of law and matters of opinion. But it may suffice to state that Her Majesty's Government have united with the other Governments interested in a representation to the Chilian Government, urging them to carry out their promise to enter into an equitable understanding with the creditors of Peru, who may have rights which merit consideration, and which have originated in acts and contracts legally established.

Mr. LABOUCHERE: I wish to know whether, in view of the trouble we have got into by meddling with the bondholders of Egypt, we are going, directly or indirectly, to meddle with the bondholders of Peru? I hope we shall have a clear answer to that Question.

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE: The answer to the Question of the hon. Member for St. Andrews has reference to what has been done, not to what we are going to do; but if the hon. Member for Northampton wishes to know anything on the subject, I shall be happy to give an answer if a Question is put on the Paper.

Mr. WILLIAMSON: My Question was with reference to what you are going to do.

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE: No, Sir.

Mr. WILLIAMSON: I shall repeat the Question on Friday.

EXPLOSIVES ACT—APPOINTMENT OF MR. JAMES MARTIN, INSPECTOR FOR BRAWNEY AND ATHLONE.

Mr. JUSTIN HUNTLY M'CARTHY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is a fact that Mr. James Martin, clerk of Petty Sessions for Brawney and Athlone, was appointed inspector under the Explosives Act at a salary of £25 per year; whether the appointment was made in the usual manner, by public notice; whether the duties were confined to the inspection of three or four houses of the urban portion of the district in which some gunpowder was sold; whether the Town Commissioners of Athlone were appointed the local authority under the Act for the urban district in 1884; whether, there being no duties to perform in the rural district, the Home Secretary would direct the attention of the Justices to the impropriety of retaining the services of Mr. Martin, under the circumstances, at the Board of Guardians' expense, especially when the services of the Constabulary are available free of expense; and, whether he would obtain, for the Guardians' information, a Return showing the names of the persons licensed; the fees paid; the detailed expenses incurred for printing, books, and postage; and the orders of the Justices directing the manner in which the fees were to be applied?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, in reply, that the gentleman referred to had been appointed for some years, and they had no information at the Home Office as to the salary paid, that being a matter entirely relegated to the Local Authority. They were not aware whether public notice was given of the appointment in this particular case; there was hardly anything for the officer to do. There were only five cases registered in the district, and there were none outside. So far as the police were concerned, a Circular was issued by the Home Office in October, 1884, to which the Irish Government assented, stating that they might be nominated as explosive officers; but the Town Commissioners had not taken advantage of it.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES (ANIMALS) ACTS — PLEURO-PNEUMONIA IN IRELAND.

Mr. ALBERT GREY asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether there has been for some time past widespread prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia in Ireland, and whether every recent outbreak of pleuro-pneumonia in England is directly traceable to the importation of Irish store cattle; whether the present practice of giving less than the full value as compensation for the slaughter of the diseased animal encourages the farmer to conceal the fact of disease, and to sell the diseased animal; whether an epidemic of pleuro-pneumonia in the State of Illinois last year was promptly and effectually suppressed by the system of purchase at full price and slaughter; whether British graziers are allowed to import Irish lean stock notwithstanding the widespread prevalence of pleuro-pneumonia in Ireland, but are not allowed to import lean stock from Western America, notwithstanding the immunity from every form of cattle disease in that country; and, whether the Privy Council will make use of the powers conferred upon them by the third section of the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act, 1884, to permit the importation into this country of store cattle from such specified parts of the United States as may be proved to be free and exempt from all disease ?

COLONEL NOLAN said, that before the Question was put, he wished also to ask the right hon. Gentleman, Whether it was not the fact that cattle in Ireland, with the single exception of the county of Dublin, had been singularly free from disease for a considerable period ?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY (Mr. CHAPLIN) : In reply to the two first parts of the Question of the hon. Member (Mr. Albert Grey), it is not the case—and this perhaps will be an answer also to the hon. and gallant Member for Galway County (Colonel Nolan)—it is not the case that there is a widespread prevalence of pleura-pneumonia in Ireland. The hon. Member (Mr. Albert Grey) is also mistaken in supposing that every recent outbreak of the disease in England is directly traceable to the importation of store cattle into England from Ireland. According to the latest official Returns, it will be found that the disease is confined to the Province of Leinster, and principally to Dublin and the neighbourhood ; and I find from last week's Return that there were not more than five fresh cases of outbreak and no more than 14 animals attacked in the whole country. In reply to the third paragraph of the Question, it must be to some extent a matter of opinion whether the present scale of compensation encourages farmers to conceal the fact of the existence of disease. We have no evidence of the fact to lead us to believe that it does ; but, in any case, the scale is prescribed by law, and the Privy Council have no power to increase it. Fourthly, I have to say that, according to the latest Returns we have received, the disease still existed in Illinois and other Western States in the spring of the present year, and I am very sceptical, therefore, as to the epidemic of which the hon. Member speaks having been effectually suppressed during last year. Under these circumstances, we are not prepared to admit cattle from those States, except subject to slaughter and quarantine.

MR. DUCKHAM asked, Whether the right hon. Gentleman could inform the House whether it was not a fact that the Canadian Government deemed it requisite to prohibit the removal of cattle through Canada from the Western States of America in consequence of disease existing in those States ?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY, in reply, said, there was no doubt that that was the fact.

DOMINION OF CANADA—THE MILITARY OPERATIONS.

MR. ALBERT GREY asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether the Government has received General Middleton's Despatch describing the recent Military operations in Canada ; and, whether he will cause such Despatch to be laid upon the Table of the House ?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH) : Yes, Sir. General Middleton's despatch has been received by Her Majesty's Government. It is, I believe, the intention of my right hon. and gallant Friend the Secretary of State for the Colonies to publish it in *The London Gazette.*

LOSS OF LIFE AT SEA—THE ROYAL COMMISSION—THE EVIDENCE.

MR. ATKINSON asked the Parliamentary Secretary to the Board of Trade, If he will lay upon the Table Copy of any Communications which may have been received at the Board of Trade, from Shipping or other Associations, protesting against the proposed issue of evidence given on behalf of the Board of Trade before the Royal Commission on Loss of Life at Sea, until the evidence on the other side of the question be also fully taken ?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) : In answer to the Question of the hon. Member, I have to say that communications have been received from the General Shipowners' Society and the Hull Incorporated Chamber of Commerce and Shipping, protesting

> "Against the publication of the *ad interim* Report of Evidence taken before the Royal Commission on Shipping on the ground of its *ex parte* character — the Board of Trade case having been presented, and but a small portion of the shipowners' reply having been as yet heard."

The Central Executive of Shipowners of the United Kingdom have forwarded to the Board of Trade copies of two letters which they have addressed to the Chairman of the Royal Commission on the subject. Without expressing an opinion as to the expediency of such partial publication, I would point out to the hon. Member that the matter rests entirely with the Commission, and that the Board of Trade have no power whatever to prevent or postpone the publication of the Report, or of any portion of it. I have no objection to lay on the Table copies of the two letters referred to in the first part of my answer.

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)—HUNGERFORD BOARD OF GUARDIANS—APPOINTMENT OF MASTER AND MATRON FOR THE WORKHOUSE.

MR. BROADHURST asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he has seen, in *The Marlborough Times* of 25th July, an advertisement of the Hungerford Union Board of Guardians for a master and matron for the workhouse, which advertisement states that they must be members of the Church of England; and, whether the Guardians are legally entitled to impose such an ecclesiastical test as a qualification for these offices; and, if not, what steps will be taken to secure the withdrawal of the advertisement?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR): There has been no meeting of the Board of Guardians since Notice of the Question was given; but I am informed by the Clerk of the Union that he prepared the advertisement in the same form as one which was issued some years since, and that the Guardians had made no specific order as to candidates being members of the Church of England. If, however, the Guardians had given directions in this matter, the Local Government Board would have no authority to interfere, as the Guardians could, if they thought fit, determine to elect candidates who are members of the Church of England. On the occasion of the last visit of our Inspector, there were 123 inmates of the workhouse, of whom two only were returned as Dissenters.

RETURNS OF GROUND RENT—HOLDERS AND OWNERS OF MINING ROYALTIES.

MR. BROADHURST asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether his attention has been directed to the two Returns, given Notice of for Thursday next, relating to Ground Rents and Royalties on Mines; and, whether he will, on behalf of the Government, undertake that these Returns shall be furnished to the extent which it may be found possible to give them by the respective departments?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that he had made inquiries of the Departments concerned; but he found that it was quite impossible for them to furnish the information desired by the hon. Member, even if the House saw fit to order the Returns which he proposed to move for. The Return of 1874 was based on the valuation list and the rate books, and on information supplied by the Clerks of Boards of Guardians and other local officers; but he was informed that the valuation list did not usually give the amount of ground rents, nor were the royalties on mining property ever stated.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE—REPORT OF COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.

MR. INCE asked Mr. Attorney General, Whether the Committee of Inquiry into the practice and procedure of the High Court of Justice, presided over by the Master of the Rolls, had made their Report; if not, whether he can state when such Report is expected to be made; and, whether a Copy will be placed upon the Table?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER), in reply, said, that the Report in question had not yet been received, and until it had been presented it was impossible to say whether it would be laid on the Table or not.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, What Business the Government proposed to take on Wednesday and Thursday?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that the first Order for to-morrow was the third reading of the Appropriation Bill, and he hoped after that they would be able to proceed with the Report on the Criminal Law Amendment Bill. On Thursday the Indian Budget would be taken.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON asked whether any Business was fixed to come on after the Indian Budget?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that that must depend upon the progress they made that night and to-morrow. He could hardly answer the Question then.

Mr. A. R. D. ELLIOTT asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, whether it was intended to go on with the Secretary for Scotland Bill that night; and, if so, after what hour it would not be taken?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross): It is intended to take the Bill to-night; but it is impossible to name an hour.

POOR LAW GUARDIANS (IRELAND) BILL—LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Mr. SEXTON asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, What course the Government mean to take on the Amendment of the Lords in the Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Bill, maintaining the vote by proxy at Poor Law Elections in Ireland, and on the Amendment maintaining the strength of ex-officio members on each Board of Guardians at one-half the total number of the Board instead of one-third, the proportion adopted by this House?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes): I am afraid I am not in a position to give a very definite answer to the hon. Member. The Amendments are very important, and would give rise to considerable discussion. On Thursday I will give a more definite answer.

Mr. SEXTON: I beg to give Notice that, in the event of the Government maintaining the Amendments of the Lords, which render the Bill worse than useless, I will move, on going into Committee, that the Order be discharged.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES BILL.

Mr. GRAY asked, When the second reading of the Bill for the Housing of the Working Classes would be taken?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, it was hardly likely that they would be able to take the second reading of the Bill before Friday.

Mr. BROADHURST asked that the modifications proposed to Clause 13 should be made known as soon as possible, observing that it was almost the only clause proposing new and valuable legislation, and he hoped it would not be cut out.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he would make known the Amendments as soon as the Forms of the House would permit.

EGYPT (THE SOUDAN)—REPORTED DEATH OF OSMAN DIGNA.

In answer to Sir Walter B. Barttelot,

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith) said, that a telegram had been received to the effect that Osman Digna was believed to have been killed, but a subsequent telegram stated that the report of his death was untrue.

EGYPT—THE MILITARY EXPEDITION TO THE SOUDAN—LORD WOLSELEY'S REPORT.

Mr. M'COAN asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether Lord Wolseley has made any Report on the late Expedition to the Soudan; and, if so, whether it will be laid before Parliament before the end of this Session?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith): Lord Wolseley has reported on his operations from time to time, and his Reports have been laid before Parliament. There are a few Papers subsequent in date to those in the collection, called Egypt No. 13, which I will take steps to have presented.

PUBLIC HEALTH (METROPOLIS)—CONTAMINATION OF THE RIVER LEA.

In reply to Mr. John Holms,

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. Balfour) said, that the Local Authority of Tottenham had decided to construct sewage works, with the view of removing the sewage of the district from the River Lea; and the Local Government Board had sanctioned the requisite loan.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. WEST said, in view of the Business of the Session, it would be convenient to know which of the remaining Government Orders they intended to proceed with?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: We hope the House will proceed with all of them.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

——o——

LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) BILL.

[*Lords*.]—[BILL 249.]

(*The Chief Secretary for Ireland.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): In rising to move that this Bill be now read a second time, I will be as brief as circumstances will permit. I am perfectly aware that I am dealing with no new subject; and, while I explain some of the provisions of the Bill, I must claim some indulgence when I say that, to me, this is a perfectly new subject, and that I am addressing large numbers on both sides of the House who are, so to speak, experts on the question of land in Ireland. At this period of the Session I am quite certain of this—that I should not only be doing an injury to the prospects of this measure by making a long statement, but that I should weary the House by recapitulating the different stages of legislation with regard to land in Ireland. Still more do I think that I ought to avoid as much as possible controversial topics; and although many sitting around me may from time to time have found serious objections with the land legislation of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Gladstone), yet I think this is no occasion for us to raise fresh controversies, or to try to prove that the prophecies we made in bygone days have been fulfilled. The House will ask us to be, at all events, practical, with the knowledge that it is impossible, even if we should wish it, to put the legislative clock back again. We consider it is our duty to take the existing state of affairs in Ireland as we find them, and to endeavour to find a remedy for a condition of things which we think more or less disastrous to the best interests of that country. Whether this Bill be a good or a bad one, whether it passes or not, I do not think that we ourselves or the House will regret spending some hours in endeavouring to promote a better state of things in Ireland, and create a stir in the land market of that country, which is now in a state of absolute stagnation, and the infusion of energy, enterprize, and the outlay of capital into its chief industries. It must be admitted that this particular branch of land legislation in Ireland has been taken up in bygone years by prominent Members on both sides of both Houses of Parliament, and, therefore, the utmost ingenuity would not suffice to bring it within the range of Party politics. It may be said that this is not a perfect Bill, and that some of its details are capable of amendment; but what I would urge on the House is this—that if in its main provisions it proceeds on the lines of previous proposals put forward from both sides of the House, and if its guarantees as regards State money are adequate, Her Majesty's Government may fairly claim, not only that it should receive due attention, but also favourable consideration for its adoption by a majority of the House. There are very strong reasons indeed why, even at this late period of the Session, this question should be dealt with. As regards this matter of the purchase of land in Ireland, it is true that for years there has been an agitation existing; but I think that Parliament itself has been very much to blame as an agitator. I will explain my meaning in this way. It is now 15 years since proposals of this nature were made in a practical shape in the Bright Clauses of the Land Act of 1870. Since then the 5th part of the Act of 1881 has further attempted to deal with this question of land purchase; and, subsequently, in 1883, a Resolution was brought forward by the noble Lord the present First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton), which met with the almost unanimous acceptance of both sides of the House. Since then the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Border Burghs (Mr. Trevelyan), in a speech of remarkable ability, also brought forward a measure attempting to deal with this vexed question; and we have something more than an intimation that, if the late Government had remained in Office, further proposals would have been made. It may be assumed, therefore, that for the last 15 years abortive proposals have been continually made on this subject, and it is impossible for any interest, and especially for such an interest as that of land, which is easily upset by false hopes and constant agitation, to thrive under such conditions, and not to be affected thereby. In having brought forward these abortive proposals, Parliament is in some respects a sinner; and I venture to urge upon the House that the time has arrived for something like decisive action to be taken—that the time has arrived to make a final effort in the right direction, and to promote, as I before observed, something like a movement in the land market in Ireland. In dealing with a measure of this kind, the main thought that will arise in the mind of any man anxious for the future of land in this country will be, in the first place, how far it is good for any community that a Bill of this sort should be universally adopted—I mean, that supposing such a scheme as we proposed should meet with universal adoption, how far it would meet with the adoption of the tenant farmers themselves. I have always held with regard to the question of tenant proprietors in England and Ireland, that there is some land far more suitable for the purpose than that in other localities. I have always held that you cannot deal the same with unfertile land as with fertile land. From my own slight experience as a farmer, I can say that there is a vast amount of land in some districts in Ireland, such as parts of Galway and Mayo, where with a certain acreage and a certain amount of stock, a balance may be made in favour of the cultivator, yet, if small holdings were created in those very districts, it might produce something like disaster to the proprietors. These are mere matters of surmise; but I would ask the House to believe that Her Majesty's Government have brought forward this Bill, at this period of the Session, by reason of the fact that, at the present moment, land is practically an unsaleable commodity in Ireland. If, therefore, a change for the better can be brought about, the Government will consider that the object of their Bill has been amply obtained. I will not detain the House long by the very slight sketch which I propose to give of the scheme of the Bill. The first and most prominent feature of the present measure which strikes the ordinary reader is, that it is entirely permissive in its character. Transactions in land under the Bill, not as regards price, but sale, also, are entirely voluntary on the part of the owner. In the next place, we propose to amend certain proposals contained in the 5th part of the Act of 1881, and also to further amend that Act by extending some of its provisions. The clauses of the Act of 1881, with regard to the purchase of holdings, were, no doubt, accepted at the time as likely to be successful; but we all know that, when put to the test of experience, they practically failed — indeed, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Border Burghs stated, in moving a similar Bill on this subject last year, as regarded the Act of 1881 and particular clauses of the Act of 1870, that if their combined action had resulted in enabling one tenant in 400 to purchase, that would be the maximum. The right hon. Gentleman at that time, by his Bill, enlarged the scheme of the Act of 1881 by providing that there should be two advances, one of a guaranteed and the other of an unguaranteed character. He proposed that the unguaranteed sum should be at the rate of £4 10*s*., and should not exceed three-fourths of the purchase money. The guarantee was to be of a local nature. I have heard that that is a proposal which, if it ever had been submitted, would not have met with the acceptance of Parliament. That scheme, however, is not the one before the House. The chief changes that we propose are that all future loans are to be granted for 49 years, at a charge of £4 per annum for every £100; and that where the loans are guaranteed, the advance is to be for the whole of the purchase money. There is a further prominent feature in the Bill, which is that power shall be granted to the Land Commission to convey an indefeasible title to the new owner by a vesting order. Then there are other changes to this effect, that the Land Commission shall only lend the whole of the purchase money where the landlord or some other person shall deposit one-fifth as a guarantee. I am aware that this question of guarantee is one which may lead to controversy. It is true that the offer is a very large and considerable one, and that the system of granting the whole of the purchase money is one that is, I believe, comparatively new, being introduced for the first time by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Border Burghs, in the proposals which were made by the late Government for legislation of this nature. But if legislation of this character is sound in itself, and if the principle has been adopted again and again by Parliament, then Her Majesty's Government are justified in proceeding further on the same lines and in advancing the whole money on the ground already mentioned. It has been urged, in some quarters, that this is too large an offer to make, and that you are placing other tenants in a disadvantageous position, perhaps, in making such a large and wide proposal; and it has also been urged that we are offering too much in the shape of a bribe—that the result will be a rush into the land market of tenants, land-jobbers, and others, and that the scope of the Bill will be extraordinarily extended. For myself, I am not afraid of any such extraordinary rush into the land market—neither can Her Majesty's Government be fairly accused in these proposals of gambling with the present situation. The present stagnation in that direction is simply lamentable; and if the Government can produce anything like a movement as regards purchase, then the Bill will have justified itself. Well, now I have further to add, with reference to this advance by the Land Commission, that 3 per cent is to be charged on the deposit of one-fifth, and that, of course, in case of failure, the Land Commission are to make use of that deposit in order to provide against loss, and they are also to be guaranteed a power of sale, which shall only be exercised as a very last resource. Then another proposal is —and it is a large proposal in the Bill— to place a charge on the Irish Church Surplus as a guarantee to our scheme. That may also be subjected to adverse criticism. First, considering that this measure is a very large advance on any previous measure of the same kind, and that it is more distinctly for the benefit of Ireland, I do not see why a fund exclusively Irish in its character should not be set apart in this way, and utilized in its support. But it must be understood that it must be regarded as to be only made use of as the very last resource, and so that any loss that may be sustained will have to be made good. There are other means, too, to be realized; for it will be the duty of the Court to make good any loss by the deposit, and to sell up the tenant, and realize, before they fall back upon the fund to which I have alluded. Then there is another change, which I have already mentioned, and that is the vesting order guaranteed by the Land Commission, and which was also in the scheme of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the Border Burghs. We propose to extend that, not only to the holding, but to the interest in the holding also. That is done with this view—that the land should be conveyed by the cheapest possible process. We assume that any tribunal appointed under an Act like this would take every possible means in their power to ascertain the title of any land they propose to convey, so that it should be conveyed, as far as they were concerned, secure from any future civil or legal process. I should like to say one word as to the machinery by which this Bill is to be carried out. It is proposed, as hon. Members are aware, to add two fresh Commissioners to the Land Commission for the purpose of carrying out the Act.

MR. SEXTON: Will the right hon. Gentleman name them?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: I have always noticed in a Bill of this kind, when it is introduced, that where a Commissioner is to be appointed, the name of the gentleman to be appointed creates more excitement and interest and discussion than the whole of the other provisions of the Bill put together. I cannot, therefore, I suppose, expect to experience any immunity as regards that matter. Of course, the Government are anxious to meet the general wishes of the House in this respect; and I think, at all events, the House will naturally expect their names to be given before we go into Committee on the Bill. I have not had sufficient experience of these vexed questions as to the working of that Court to be able to form a judgment on the course we propose. It is enough for me to mention that the question has been most carefully considered by the Lord Chancellor of Ireland and other Members of the Government, who have given a vast amount of attention to the question for many years; and I need not tell hon. Members that, if these proposals are to be carried out successfully, there will be an enormous onus thrown on the tribunal, and the Government, therefore, are very anxious that the Court shall be as strong as possible. The proposal in the Bill is to give the Land Commission power to appoint a solicitor, who would deal with the vexed question of title. Other powers will also be given, the aim of which is to strengthen the tribunal under the Bill, to which I need not now further allude. I shall not detain the House more than a few minutes longer. The House is quite aware that this Bill, which is bristling with legal technicalities, is not an easy question for a layman to handle. I will, however, give the House its main features before I sit down. One main feature is, that in the case of any sale, it being a voluntary act between landlord and tenant, one-fifth of the purchase money is to be devoted to the guarantee fund. The next important change is the advance for a term of 49 years of the purchase money at a charge of £4 for every £100. As to the working of the Bill itself, I will give one short example before I sit down. In the case of a tenant who is paying £10 rent, if he buys his land at 20 years' purchase, say, £200, under the Bill, the charge of the Land Commission to the purchaser will be £8 per annum, and the proportion of the tenant's rate will be something like 12*s.* a-year. The purchaser will, therefore, pay at the rate of £8 12*s.* per year for 49 years, as against £10; and, at the end of 49 years, the land becomes the absolute property of the late tenant. It may be said that that is a very large offer; and it may also be noted that it creates a great deal of discrepancy between a purchaser under this Bill and other tenants; but I believe these matters will very much settle themselves, if the Bill be adopted by the House. But hon. Members must also remember that, if the Bill has any successful result at all, it will improve the demand for land, and most likely prevent anything like a considerable diminution of rent. I have to thank the House for listening so patiently to a somewhat imperfect statement, and for having accorded to it a consideration which it has scarcely deserved. Her Majesty's Government are most anxious that the Bill should become law in as speedy a time as possible. Although this is a late period of the Session, and although only a very short space of time has elapsed since they have accepted Office, yet, looking at the state of things in Ireland, where the difficult questions relating to the land are of the most vital importance as affecting all interests in that country, the Government refuse to sit with their hands folded, and to do nothing to promote a better and more prosperous state of things in the interests of the whole community. The right hon. Baronet concluded by moving the second reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*The Chief Secretary for Ireland.*)

Mr. WALKER said, that, as far as he personally was concerned, he desired to support the principle of the Bill. As he understood the Bill, it might be divided into three parts. The first related to the guarantee, which consisted of the deposit of one-fifth, and the advance of the whole of the purchase money; the second related to the legal machinery by which the Bill was to be worked; and the third related to the use to be made of the Church Surplus Fund. He was in favour of the first point; but so far as regarded the legal machinery which the Bill provided, he was not in a position to condemn it, inasmuch as that legal machinery constituted a portion of, and indeed was a transcript of, the Bill of the late Government, for which he (Mr. Walker) was himself, to a great extent, responsible. The deposit of one-fifth of the purchase money was a substitute for the guarantee of the Local Authority provided by the Bill brought in by his right hon. Friend the late Chief Secretary for Ireland (Mr. Trevelyan); but he (Mr. Walker) must confess, however, that he preferred the machinery which the present Bill provided. But when he came to the proposal relating to the Church Surplus Fund, he looked at that in an entirely different manner, and he could not quite agree with the proposal embodied in the Bill. That fund, as he understood it, was set apart in order to be devoted to great national objects, such as Education and Imperial purposes, and it was in the hands of the State still. He could not, therefore, understand why the State should guarantee the State in the way proposed, or why that fund, whatever its amount might be, but which was said to amount to about £1,000,000, should be diverted to what appeared to him to be an illegitimate purpose, from its otherwise legitimate one—namely, to serve one of two purposes; either to increase the price of land unduly, or to secure the debt of the improvident man at the expense of the provident one. The dedication of that fund for the object mentioned seemed to him to be unnecessary, and contrary to the principle of the Act of Parliament. This use of the Church Surplus was an unnecessary excrescence on the Bill, and it would be impolitic to apply it in the manner proposed. He wished now to advert to two or three matters which had struck him in the reading of the Bill. He did not think that the provisions by which it was proposed that £5,000,000 should be allocated to the purchase of land so as to create a peasant proprietary was at all sufficient. Unless the Act was to be a tentative measure, it appeared to him to be a ridiculous sum for such a purpose. The proposal in the Bill of the late Chief Secretary for that purpose was to allocate £20,000,000. He desired, too, to see a few alterations made in regard to the legal machinery. Power was given to the Land Commissioners to declare that a sale was made subject to a mortgage or charge. In his opinion, that provision was extremely objectionable. Another matter worthy of notice, looking to the future working of the Bill, was that of the purchasers under the Act of 1870, excluding glebe tenants, who would occupy a peculiar position under it; but the position of the purchasers under the Act of 1881 was one which would require serious consideration. If they were left in their present position, much heart-burning would be created which the right hon. Gentleman who moved the second reading of the Bill would have to answer for. Therefore, how they were to be dealt with was a matter for his consideration. Again, in the case of tenants belonging to a village or town which formed a portion of the estate that was about to be sold, he thought these tenants should not be left out in the cold. Provision ought also to be made to prevent a loss accruing to the landlord for the investigation of title and other legal formalities, in case the sale of the property was not carried out. That portion of the Bill he (Mr. Walker) proposed to remedy at a future stage. The working of the Act would depend upon the persons who had to carry it into effect; and, therefore, before the Act could be criticized fully, it was necessary to know to whom its administration was to be intrusted. He hoped, therefore, the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland would soon be able to name the persons by whom the Bill was to be administered. If it should once get into the minds of the Irish people that the Act was passed for the purpose of enabling the landlord to sell his land at an increased price, it would be certain to be a dead letter. On looking at the 17th clause, hon. Members would see how important it was that the names of those persons should be known to the House; for it would be seen that the Lord Lieutenant had the power to provide that those two Commissioners should specially attend to the business imposed on the Land Commission by this Act. What would be the result? This Act imposed upon the Commission duties of a most important judicial character; and supposing, as he thought himself entitled to assume, that the two new Commissioners were laymen, were they to be charged alone with the execution of this judicial business, from which the legal Chief of the Commission was excluded? Then there was the important question of the value of incumbrances to be considered. The Bill gave power to the Commissioners to apportion incumbrances, annual charges, and so forth, and he thought it ought also to give them power to capitalize, commute, and to value those charges. He alluded to these difficulties with the most friendly feeling towards the Bill; for, however much he might doubt the wisdom of certain provisions, the object of the Bill had his most entire approval.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, the reason he had blocked the Bill was not because he disapproved of its principle—that of the purchase of land by tenants—for that had been for a long time a great desire of his to see carried into effect, but because he believed that the measure was wholly inadequate for the purpose proposed, and that, therefore, it would be an abortive one. He had been in great hope, when he understood that the noble and learned Lord the Lord Chancellor of Ireland (Lord Ashbourne) was going to bring in a Bill dealing with the subject, that it would be an effective measure, one that would be of great service in enabling tenants to purchase their holdings; but, as it was now framed, he felt compelled to look upon it with great disappointment. He had searched high and low throughout the Bill to find one redeeming feature in it; but he could discover nothing in it that would commend it to his notice. The most that could be predicted in its favour was that it might be wholly inoperative; but he was afraid that, if it passed, instead of being inoperative, it would be highly dangerous on the one hand, and, to an absolute certainty, it would be exceedingly costly and expensive on the other. The Body which would be appointed by the Bill to carry out its conditions, would be the Land Commission; and those who knew anything about Ireland were fully cognizant of the working of the Land Commission to know that, by its working, the Purchase Clauses of the Land Act of 1881 had been rendered nugatory. In proof of that, he had only to refer to the Return which had been called for by himself, which showed the manner in which the Land Act had been worked. It showed where tenants were anxious to purchase, and where purchasers were anxious to give a fair and not at all an extravagant price for their holdings, that the officers of the Land Court, by precept and by advice to hold on a little longer and they would get the land cheaper, had dissuaded them from carrying their intentions into effect, or they had declined to advance the money. Thus, in one case in the county of Mayo, where the landlord and the tenant had agreed that the purchase of the holding should be carried into effect at the price of 16½ years' purchase, and the security was considered so good that the local bank had undertaken to advance the remaining one-fourth of the purchase money, the Land Commission had interferred to prevent the landlord from selling and the tenant from purchasing at that price, and had refused to advance the three-fourths of the purchase money, with the result that they themselves eventually bought the unfortunate proprietor out at 12 years' purchase. In his opinion, the present deadlock in the Irish land market was entirely due to the action of the Land Commission, to whom it was proposed to intrust the carrying into effect of the provisions of the present Bill. Why did not the Government propose to intrust the working of the Bill to the Landed Estates Court, which was an excellent tribunal, exactly suitable and competent for the purpose, and which, in any case, would have to be referred to in almost every transaction? That Court had full power to carry out sales; they had the power to apportion, and the knowledge how to apportion incumbrances, and commanded the confidence of the mortgagees? Why was that admirable Body to be ignored, and why should they be paid for doing nothing? The proposal in the present Bill was to appoint two officers, and that two fresh offices were to be created, and more public money was to be spent unnecessarily. Those two officers had not been named; and he contended that, inasmuch as their appointment would cause an expenditure of public money, that hon. Members should be informed as to whom the Government intended appointing. But it appeared that the Government were going to bring in two officers, about whom the House had no knowledge whatever at present, to carry out the most important, complicated, and difficult duties that had ever been intrusted to any gentlemen in connection with the Irish Land Question. Those officers would have power over the sale of about one-half of the entire land of Ireland. They proposed paying them £2,000 per annum. They could not get good professional men — they could not get men worth their salt and in decent practice—who would accept the position for so small a remuneration. The Government proposed to put a couple of men in an inferior position amongst others at a salary not exceeding two-thirds of that of the gentlemen among whom they would have to sit according to the proposed constitution of the Court. If the work was to be done in that way at all, it would be infinitely better done by appointing one thoroughly good man who should be well and adequately remunerated for his services. If the Government got the Landed Estates Court to do the drudgery, he believed there would be plenty of really competent men to be obtained who would do the work proposed to be given to the two Commissioners gratis; but it would not be possible to get men to undertake the duties of the office if it were to be in any way associated with the Land Commission unless they were paid adequately for their services. He wanted to know why it was that the names of the proposed Commissioners had been kept secret? He should have thought that if the Government had been able to secure the services of really good men to work the measure, instead of being ashamed of their names, they would have been only two anxious to make them public. The success of a measure of the kind depended upon the character and stability of the men by whom it was administered. He spoke the views of moderate men on both sides of the House, when he complained that the names of the proposed Commissioners were not given, so that hon. Members might criticize them at that stage. It had been said that the names of the Commissioners under the Land Act had not been made known until just before the measure had reached the Committee stage in that House; but it must be recollected that that Bill had been introduced in that House, whereas the present measure had been introduced in the House of Lords. There was a great deal in this Bill that savoured of sham to his mind. It was going to be a sham Court. If, as he had said, the proposed Commissioners were good men, the Government would not be ashamed to name them. The sum of £5,000,000 put down for expenditure under the measure was a sham, because nothing under £20,000,000 would enable the measure to be successfully carried out, and the proposal to reserve one-fifth of the purchase money was even a greater sham still. Under a reasonable Act, he believed a great deal might be done with the sum of £20,000,000, as proposed by the right hon. Gentleman the late Chief Secretary for Ireland. They were told that this was a noble and generous measure, and that the tenant was to have the whole of the purchase money. Well, he supposed that if the tenant who bought the land was, for that purpose, to receive the whole of the purchase money, the person who sold the land should also receive from that tenant the whole of the purchase money. But it was to be otherwise. Whilst the whole of the purchase money would be advanced to the tenant, the vendor would only receive four-fifths of the amount, the other fifth being absorbed by the State in the event of the tenant not paying his instalments. That was equivalent to the State promising £1 and paying 16*s*. The probability was that the provisions of the measure would be taken advantage of only by men who were utterly broken down in resources and in credit, and who were so hard pressed by their creditors that they would accept anything. He did not believe that the provisions of the Bill would be taken advantage of at all, because another sham connected with the measure was—and the noble and learned Lord who introduced the Bill knew it perfectly well—that the tenants had not the slightest intention of availing themselves of the provisions of the Bill. They did not mean to buy their holdings. They were imbued with the idea that they were going to get the fee simple of the land without paying for it at all, and he believed they had been very much encouraged in this belief by the action of the Land Commissioners. In Ireland at the present moment there were those who regularly bought the interest in their holdings; but that was a very different matter from purchasing the holdings. When a tenant was willing to give 16 or 18 years' purchase, agitators stepped in and said—"Hold on and you will get your holding without doing that;" and it was not likely that tenants, because of that or any other Bill, would immediately spring up and give a fancy price for their farms. They knew very well what was thought by a certain class in the North of Ireland on this measure. They knew what was the opinion of Mr. Michael Davitt, and those who were associated with that gentleman, upon it. He had spoken very strongly at public meetings, and had called it a "Bill for the Relief of Pauper Landlords." He advised, and in very clever and very strong language he had almost ordered, the tenants not to purchase their holdings; and he (Colonel King-Harman) had very good reason to believe that that advice would be acted upon. It might be that there would be found a man here and there more enterprizing than his neighbours who would be willing to purchase; but the Bill would not be taken advantage of generally. A landlord might get offers to purchase a farm here and a farm there; but that would introduce a system of having small farms dotted indiscriminately over an estate, which would be objected to by the landlords, who were opposed to anything but a continuity of holdings. The unwillingness of tenants to avail themselves of powers of the sort was shown by the fact that last year only 241 applications to purchase came before the Land Commission, and out of those 241 cases there were 144 where single tenants would have purchased their holdings, and there were nearly 100 where tenants in twos and threes wished also to do so, and the landlords would not agree to that. Beyond that, a great many of those were refused by the Commission because the tenant and landlord had agreed upon what the Commission considered was too high a price. In most cases the Land Commission would not give 16 years' purchase, though in two cases they had allowed 26 years and 28 years. But it so happened that in the former case the landlord was a Member of the present Government, and in the latter case a Member of the late Government. He did not mean to impute any motives to the vendors in those cases; but the circumstances were somewhat suspicious. He would tell the House that although some landlords would not sell, they would do what they could to assist in the formation of a peasant proprietary. They would give leases in perpetuity, fee farm grants, &c. He would ask whether the Government would try to make this a good and useful Bill by granting some powers for the granting of perpetuity leases and fining down rents? If the Government were really anxious to do a great amount of good with the measure, that would be really the very best thing which they could do. If they would advance the whole of the money for the purpose of fining down rents, it would do a vast amount of good to both landlords and tenants. He objected to the measure as it stood, because it seemed to have been brought in in much the same way in which railways were made abroad in Russia. The Czar took a map and a ruler and drew a line from one place to another, and said—"We are going to make a railway between those two places," irrespective of the difficulties which existed in the physical conformation of the districts over which they were to pass. Just in the same headlong way the Government said—"We are going to give you a Purchase Bill." In his opinion, the Government had had the opportunity—indeed, they had it still—of working out this matter in a statesmanlike manner, but had not taken advantage of it. They ought to look the matter boldly in the face, and not to run away from it. If the Government had consulted men of experience who lived in Ireland, without confining the matter within the narrow limits in which it had been kept, they would have found out what would have been best for the country. He hoped, however, they would even yet bring forward a measure which would be acceptable to those for whom it was intended, and which would realize the result which was desired.

COLONEL NOLAN said, he desired to speak entirely for himself, and not—as he had been unable to consult with them—on behalf of those hon. Members with whom he had been usually associated in matters of this kind during the past couple of years. He was well acquainted with the views of both landlords and tenants in the West of Ireland, and believed that they would be favourable to the measure. He was very much struck with the speech of the hon. and gallant Member for Dublin County (Colonel King-Harman); but he (Colonel Nolan) believed that £5,000,000 was amply sufficient, for he believed there certainly would not be £5,000,000 worth of land sold before the new Parliament met; and even if there was, and more money were needed, it could be applied for. He thought that there were many little faults in the Bill which might be taken exception to; for he believed that the lawyers, in drafting measures of the kind, adhered too much to the old system of feudal tenure. The best way would be to destroy the whole entail and feudal system. He believed that its machinery was a distinct improvement on that of the Land Act, although, as far as it went, the machinery of that Act was good and proper. In the case of this Bill, however, he did not think the guarantee was at all necessary; for it appeared to him that the most important point in the Bill had escaped the notice of the previous speakers, and had only been mentioned incidentally. That was the reduction of the rate of interest from 5 per cent to 4 per cent. Now, he regarded that as the most important part of the Bill. By that it would be possible for the tenant to purchase his land by the payment of a rent not exceeding the amount he was now paying. Therefore, he supported the second reading of the Bill; and, on the whole, he would like to see it pass very much, especially as it proposed to enable the tenants to purchase under terms that would insure the whole of the advance at 4 per cent. It would afford an opportunity of seeing whether they were willing to purchase on the terms offered to them. There was, however, one important blot which might be easily got over in Committee, and that was that there was no provision for increasing the holding of the tenant. He thought it would be quite possible to introduce a clause which would enable a tenant not only to purchase his own holding on the terms mentioned in the Bill but also a few adjoining acres of a grass farm with the consent of the owner. There were many tenants who would be very desirous to obtain a small piece of grass land; and there were, in many places, vast tracts of land which, under the strict rules of economy, should not be all under grass at all. If some provision were introduced into the Bill which would enable tenants to acquire small portions of such grass land near their holdings, he believed that it would meet with very great favour in both Mayo and Galway. It would give the Bill a great impetus, and with such a clause he believed that the Bill might be a considerable success. He should, therefore, at the proper time, move the insertion of a clause of the nature he had sketched. It would, doubtless, be a salutary provision, and he hoped the Government would see their way to agreeing to it. Of course, there was much to be said against the Bill, and certain political difficulties had to be taken into consideration; but he believed that if they were, at that stage of the Session, to enter into any such matters, and to re-open the whole agrarian question in Ireland, the Bill would not have the slightest chance of becoming law.

MR. LEWIS said, he hoped sincerely that the suggestion of the hon. and gallant Member opposite (Colonel Nolan) would not be taken up by the Government. The idea that a tenant should be able to insist upon obtaining portion of a neighbouring property——

COLONEL NOLAN: No, no. I did not say they should insist at all.

MR. LEWIS, resuming, said, he believed that there would be no difficulty in making a purchase under the present law, in a case where both parties were agreed. He thought that they could understand the introduction of the cloven foot in any other case of that sort. He was sure that they all hoped to see a settlement of the differences between landlords and tenants in Ireland. He did not think, however, although he should be heartily glad to see the reverse, that it was very likely that the Bill would be very largely taken advantage of. Unfortunately, besides other strong reasons, property in Ireland was so much subject to mortgage that it would be very difficult to arrange matters respecting sales in such a way as to satisfy the claims of mortgagor, mortgagee, and purchaser. It was, also, from that cause, almost impossible to acquire a good, clear title to small portions of land under the existing legal provisions. As to the remarks with regard to the Church Surplus, it did not seem to him that the Bill was open to objection on that account. Indeed, he could not understand why so many references had been made to that fund. It seemed to him that hon. Members had forgotten that Parliament had long since given up the idea of restricting it to the purposes originally intended. No doubt, when the Irish Church Act was passed, there was a solemn pledge given by Parliament as to the objects to which that Surplus was to be applied. But no sooner was that pledge given than there was the greatest eagerness on both sides of the House to get rid of it; and when his hon. and learned Friend opposite (Mr. Walker) objected to this fund being pledged under the Bill, he ought to remember that it was also pledged under the Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Act of his own Government in 1882. In fact, he (Mr. Lewis) had been under the impression that Parliament was solemnly pledged to use it only for certain purposes; but that pledge was no longer recognized on either side of the House. Then he (Mr. Lewis) was of the opinion that £5,000,000 was quite enough to provide in the first instance for the purposes of the Bill. Looking to their experience of the Bright Clauses of the Act of 1870, no one could be so sanguine as to suppose that even under this, as it had been termed, most generous measure, £5,000,000 would not be sufficient to meet any demands that were likely to arise before the next Session of Parliament. He also thought the Government were quite right to make it a tentative measure. They might, after it had been tried, enlarge the amount, and introduce such amendments and alterations as experience would point out in the way of extension. Then, as to the Bill itself, it proceeded on the lines of old measures, for the House would recollect that by the Church Act of 1869, three-fourths of the purchase money was to be advanced at 4 per cent, repayable in 32 years, but not by way of annuity, but by way of advance of three-fourths of the purchase money at 4 per cent, the capital being repayable in 64 equal half-yearly instalments. That was rather an onerous bargain. In 1870 the first Irish Land Act passed, and then two-thirds of the purchase money was to be advanced, repayable by way of annuity at 5 per cent—that was to say, 4 per cent for interest, and 1 per cent for sinking fund. Then came the Land Act of 1881. Under that there was the same term of 35 years for the annuity, and three-fourths of the purchase money was to be advanced at 5 per cent. What was the Bill now before them? Surely they must all be impressed by the unfortunate relations which existed between landlords and tenants in Ireland, and by the great puplic interest which were involved in those circumstances, and they must, therefore, all desire the Bill to succeed, even if they did not think that it would. Did it then, he would ask, present features of an attractive character? He thought it did. First, the rate of interest was only 4 per cent—that was 3½ for interest and £1 per cent for sinking fund. That was, it seemed to him, a most generous and liberal offer from the State. Where he thought the Bill was onerous and would require alteration was in regard to the deposit of one-fifth of the purchase money. He maintained that if they were to regard the tenantry of Ireland as an honest respectable set of men this deposit was not necessary. Let it be remembered that the security which the State would hold against its advance was not only the landlord's interest in the property, but also the tenant's, which in many instances in the North of Ireland was worth more than the landlord's. The tenant's interest would be included in the mortgage just as well as the landlord's, and thus they would have a double security for the purchase money. He believed that the real mode of settling the Irish Land Question originally would have been by the institution of a liberal and generous system of land purchase. Half the misery and the public scandal produced by agrarian disputes in Ireland or by the unpleasant relations between landlord and tenant would have been avoided if the Bright Clauses had been made the primary instead of the subsidiary portion of the Land Act of 1881; and his great fear was that this retention of one-fifth of the purchase money would be a great impediment to the success of this measure. But as regarded the deposit, he must point out to his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Dublin County (Colonel King-Harman) that the deposit would not necessarily come out of the landlord's pocket. If a tenant was anxious to buy he might agree to make the deposit himself. He must say that he far preferred the mode of guarantee which the late Government proposed to adopt in their last Bill. His belief was that that was a matter of vast importance to the safety of society, to the goodness of the debt, to the validity of the change, in making a guarantee of the district of the Poor Law Union binding the whole population to see that no defaulters were in their midst—he thought that morally that was one of the most valuable features in the Bill of the late Government, and one which would have carried them over difficulties of a financial character. It would have tended to promote, in the most powerful manner, the peace, good order, credit, and safety of the State. However, that was gone by, and it could not be denied that the security under which they were now asked to sanction an advance of public money was most ample. He next came to a most important and serious point which he thought the House should consider. There were a few purchasers under the Bright Clauses of the Act of 1870, who were now paying 5 per cent annuities for 35 years. In what position would they stand after the passing of the Bill?

They would naturally say—"What fools we were when we took advantage of the provisions of the Act of 1870, when we might have had better terms by waiting; now we are left in the lurch with an annuity which involves 4 per cent, whereas those purchasers who have delayed until the present time will have the full amount of the purchase money advanced to them." It was, of course, possible to rectify the position of matters with reference to the small numbers of persons who had so purchased, and it would be only fair to do so. If it was not done a good deal of soreness would be left behind which might be the source of future controversies and disputes. He asked the House also to consider the position of those persons who had purchased under the Irish Church Act of 1869, and whose position was still worse, for they had purchased on the basis of the then existing rents, which had since been reduced under the operation of the Irish Land Act of 1881 from 20 to 25 per cent. Nor was that all, for the purchasers under the Church Act paid a higher rate of interest, with a shorter term of repayment, than under this Bill. These men ought to be placed in such a position that they would suffer no disadvantage from having bought before the Land Act of 1881. The present Bill should provide for all the points he had mentioned; and in that case it would be, even more than at present, a measure worthy the support and sanction of the House, and one that ought to be supported in a generous and thorough spirit, with no desire to carp at or criticize, but with an earnest wish that it might prove to be one tending to settle many of those problems with which the Irish Land Question was surrounded. That the provisions of the Bill taken as a whole in practical detail were generous, liberal, and fair to the landlords and tenants, while they were perfectly safe to the State, he ventured to affirm; and while he must press, without as he trusted any danger to the State, for a relaxation of the provisions with regard to the retention by the State of one-fifth of the purchase money as a guarantee, he did most earnestly press on the House not to pass by the grievous cases of hardship which the purchasers from the Irish Church Commissioners and those who had received advances under the Acts of 1870 and 1881 would suffer, if they were held to the terms of purchase laid down in those Acts, which compared so unfavourably with those embodied in the present measure. Let the House not falter in doing an act of fair play and justice to a body of men not connected with any particular Party or belonging to any particular class of society. The Bill was capable of being made a useful measure, and he hoped it would receive the sanction of the House.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, as the subject-matter of the Bill was one in which he had taken much interest for some years past, and had had a part in previous legislation, he would claim the attention of the House for some comments on it. It was when the present Government were last in Office in 1878, that he moved for, and presided over, an important Committee for inquiry into the working of the Bright Clauses of the Land Act of 1870 with a view to ascertain the best means of facilitating the acquisition of their holdings by tenants in Ireland; and, after that Committee had been appointed, he subsequently carried a Resolution in that House against the opposition of the then Government, calling upon them to give effect to the recommendations of that Committee, and to legislate on the subject. It had always been his belief that if they had then acted in a generous spirit on that Resolution and the Report of that Committee, much that had since occurred in Ireland might have been avoided. Popular opinion in Ireland was at that time in favour of the tenants becoming owners of their holdings. The best evidence of that was to be found in the fact that three-fourths of the glebe holders of that time became owners of their holdings under terms very far less advantageous than those now offered. The opportunity was lost on that occasion—no action was taken. Then followed the land agitation in Ireland; and, later, the Land Act of 1881. He had no desire, however, to rake up past controversies; but he desired to refer to the Report of that Committee, as it laid down certain principles within which the State might safely lend its aid to such a proposal, which he still himself adhered to. The fact was, that in the turn of the wheel of events the position of Parties seemed to have become reversed on this question. At the time he spoke of, it was the tenants of Ireland who were anxious for the opportunity of purchasing their holdings, and who desired an amendment of the Land Laws in Ireland in order to obtain full security, and the landlords were somewhat supine. As far as he could see, it was now the landlords of Ireland who came forward, and were urging the State to offer inducements to tenants to purchase their holdings, and who were offering splendid bribes with that object, while the tenants were supine upon the point. He was afraid that, even when this generous Bill was passed, in the present state of Ireland it would not have much effect. The real fact was that, at the time he spoke of, there appeared no prospect of obtaining any considerable amendment of the land tenure of Ireland; and it was vastly more important than it now was to move in the direction of full ownership. In 1881 the Land Act was passed, and that completely changed the position of the Irish tenants. It gave them a security of tenure, and a security of the improvements which they themselves effected in their holdings far beyond what was expected in 1878. The Land Act of 1881 was one of the greatest land reforms that was ever effected in any country, and one which might be defended on its merits upon economical grounds and upon grounds of justice; but since then it seemed to him that the Irish tenants had been far less eager and anxious to avail themselves of facilities for purchase of their holdings. The same Act embodied all the recommendations of the Committee of 1878, and the terms then offered by the State were extremely liberal. It was his belief that, in any ordinary times, the amended Bright Clauses would have produced very considerable effect; but the times had not been ordinary, and, in fact, it must be admitted they had not had much effect. That had been due to several causes. One point was that which he had already alluded to—namely, that the Tenure Clauses of the Act of 1881 had given such complete security that there was no longer the same motive or anxiety for becoming full owners as before. The second was that there was still so much uncertainty as to the future—when expectations, referred to by the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) and the hon. and gallant Member for Dublin County (Colonel King-Harman), were being held out by a political Party so powerful in Ireland as that represented and led below the Gangway that further great amendments would be made in the Land Act and land tenure, leading possibly to a further reduction of rent—it was not to be expected that tenants would be very anxious to enter into bargains with their landlords for the purchase of their holdings upon terms based on the present rents.

Colonel KING-HARMAN: I beg the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. I never suggested anything of the kind.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he did not put the words in the mouth of the hon. and gallant Gentleman, but alluded to the feeling entertained by the tenants in Ireland.

Colonel KING-HARMAN: I said they thought they would get the land for nothing.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, that the hon. and gallant Gentleman now went farther than he (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had suggested. Personally, he did not believe the Irish tenants expected to get the land for nothing. On the contrary, they must expect them to wait and see the result of the General Election, and the views which the next Parliament might have upon this subject. It was his belief that that feeling would remain, and that, until all expectations of further great changes or reductions of rent were removed, no considerable effect would be given to any proposals for facilitating the purchase of holdings, even if the present Bill were passed with the most liberal offers. He knew that of late years many landlords had made most liberal offers to their tenants under the Act of 1881, proposing to leave the remaining one-fourth of the purchase money on second mortgage upon such terms that the tenants would pay less in the future in the shape of interest and instalments of the capital than their previous rent, and had met with no response to them. The offers had been invariably refused in the spirit to which he had alluded. The uncertainty as to the future had equally operated to prevent the sale of the landlord's property in the Landed Estates Court. In the uncertainty as to the future, the possibility of further agitation to reduce rents, it was not to be wondered at that purchasers should be unwilling to invest in land in Ireland. He was aware that some high authorities, such as the Duke of Argyll and, he thought, the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Westminster (Mr. W. H. Smith), had attributed the block in the Landed Estates Court and the unsaleability of land to the fact that they had, by the Land Act, created a dual ownership of land, and that so long as property in land was not absolute that unsaleability would continue. He thought that was an error. It was a misconception of the effect and meaning of the Act of 1881 in relation to what existed before. In fact, before the Act of 1881, in a great part of Ireland, and certainly in Ulster, and on all well-managed estates elsewhere, a dual ownership of land had practically existed. By the custom of Ulster the tenant's interest was practically secure, and no landlord could deal with his land in the same absolute manner as in England. The Act of 1881 only gave full legal effect to that custom, and extended it over the whole of Ireland; but the existence of the previous custom and the practical dual ownership of land in Ulster did not prevent land being bought and sold for very fair prices, and, indeed, at a higher rate than in other parts of Ireland, where there was no such complete custom protecting the tenant's interest. It was his (Mr. Shaw Lefevre's) confident belief that the unsaleability of land at the present moment was due not to the dual ownership of land, but to the uncertainty as to the future — to the fear of further changes in the Act. They must recollect that purely agricultural land in England was now almost as unsaleable as it was in Ireland. Although they had had no Land Act here, there had been great reductions of rent —quite as great as in Ireland—and there was as much uncertainty here, not of a political character, but of an economic character, as to the future prices of agricultural produce, that land was almost unsaleable. Now, the Bill before them was mainly promoted in the interest of landlords. It was their hope that by its means they would be able to remove the block in the Landed Estates Court, to restore to land its saleable quality, by inducing the tenants to buy, and by using the State credit for the purpose. In fact, the terms offered in it formed, in his opinion, the most splendid bribe which had ever been held out in that direction. It proposed to reduce the rate of interest at which the State was to lend money from 3½ to 3 per cent; to extend the time of repayment from 35 to 49 years; and to advance the whole of the purchase money without any local guarantee. There was, indeed, a provision that one-fifth of the purchase money was to be retained by the State until that proportion of the purchase money was repaid by the annual instalments—that was, for 15 years. He could not, however, regard this provision as of any real importance or any real security to the State, for the real danger to the State was not the default of an individual, but a general movement in Ireland directed against the State for the reduction of the interest. The State, through the Land Commission, would be in direct relation to the occupying purchaser, and would be responsible for the collection of the whole of the interest. The retention of one-fifth of the purchase money was no security as between the State and the new purchaser; it would, however, be very inconvenient to the owner of the property who sold by keeping him out of his money for a long period, and it was of the nature of those provisions which would be knocked away, either in Committee or in the future. He would venture to suggest, therefore, that the Government would do wisely to abandon it. Setting aside that provision, let him look at the effect of the operation, and let him illustrate it by a case. Suppose a holding of £50 a-year, and let them presume that 20 years' purchase was agreed upon between the tenant and the owner. The purchase money would be £1,000, the whole of which the State would advance, retaining, however, one-fifth of it for 15 years. By reducing the interest to 3 per cent and spreading the repayment over so long a period as 49 years, the annual sum payable by the tenant purchaser would be only £40 a-year; of that, however, £10 a-year was practically an annual investment by the tenant purchaser in redemption of the fee, and adding, therefore, to his interest every year. It was only the interest of £30 which would compare with his previous rent of £50. Even with the instalment of the principal, and even if they added his share of local taxes now paid by the landlord, the tenant purchaser's payment would be much less than his previous rent, and he would become owner without any exertion whatever of his own. Now, let him point out the effect of this, if it should be largely adopted in Ireland. Suppose any landlord, for the purpose of relieving his property of incumbrances, were to sell to one-half of his tenants upon those terms. The effect would be that one-half of his tenants would be paying rent for ever, and the other half would be paying considerably less than their rent for a term of years; in fact, the real outgoing would be only three-fifths of their previous rent. What would be the views of those who would be paying rent for ever? Would they not complain greatly of their position? It appeared to him that the terms of the Bill were so generous, that if they were adopted to any large extent, and any considerable proportion of tenants were to become owners on such terms, it would be a considerable source of danger in the future. It would give rise to great discontent among those who were not favoured in that way, and they would either see an agitation to make the terms universal and compulsory, and for the general expropriation of landlords, or they would have a fresh agitation for a further reduction of rent on the part of those who remained tenants. He would also point out that there was another possible danger. Supposing these terms were largely accepted and a great number of tenants became owners of their holdings, and the State received their rents and practically was in the position of landlord, having advanced the whole purchase money, and being responsible through the Land Commission for the collection of the whole of the rent and of the whole instalments for a period of 49 years, there would be danger—unless there was some intervening local authority to act as a buffer. His right hon. Friend the Member for the Border Burghs (Mr. Trevelyan), in his Bill of last year, made provision for such local authority by requiring that there should be a local guarantee for the interest. That, however, did not give satisfaction, and in the absence of good local government in Ireland it was impossible to provide for any such security. He could not but hope, however, that in the new Parliament, with a greater extension of local self-government in its truer sense, some such provision might be passed which would provide a guarantee against the possible danger to the State to which he alluded. He looked upon the measure as tentative, and he ventured to hope that if any extension was to be made beyond the very moderate total contemplated by this Bill—namely, of £5,000,000—it would, in his opinion, be desirable that the operation should be effected, not directly through the Imperial Exchequer, but through the Local Authorities, who would be responsible for the collection of interest. But for the reasons he had stated, that until the Irish people saw what the disposition of the new Parliament would be upon the point, he did not think there would be any great application of this measure. Whenever the Irish people knew that no further extension would be made of the principle of the Irish Land Act, he had no doubt that a great number of applications under the Bill would take place. For the reasons he had stated, he believed that the Government had acted wisely in limiting the scope of the Bill to £5,000,000, leaving to future consideration the terms on which the measure might be extended, if, hereafter, it should be found desirable to do so. There was one other point which he wished to mention, and that was with regard to the purchasers of the glebe land of the Disestablished Church of Ireland. He could not but think that a very strong case had been made out by his hon. Friend (Mr. Lewis) in favour of the inclusion of these purchasers in the more liberal terms granted by the present Bill. It should be remembered that when the purchases under the Disestablishment Act were made the price of land was at its maximum, and that these persons gave 24 or 25 years' purchase upon their rents. They had not benefited by the Land Act of 1881, and their rent had been taken at an amount from which it might have been reduced if they had remained in their condition of tenants. He believed that many of the purchasers of glebe land had gone through much suffering and hardship in the endeavour honestly to pay their yearly instalments to the State. Looking at the whole position, and the fact that when these purchases were effected the price of land in Ireland was at its highest, he thought that these persons were entitled to great consideration from the present Government. So he thought, also, were the purchasers under the Land Act of 1870, though not the purchasers under the Act of 1881. The latter had not so strong a case; for they bought subject to the possibility of their rents being reduced by the Land Commission. On the whole, looking at it merely as a tentative measure he should give the Bill his support, though, recognizing that it had danger in it as regarded the future, he should reserve to himself the liberty of making any conditions which might be thought desirable with regard to any future extension of the scheme.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. PLUNKET) said, that had it not been for the concluding words of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) he (Mr. Plunket) should not have known that the right hon. Gentleman intended to support the present Bill. The right hon. Gentleman's speech was partly philosophical and partly historical; and it was condemnatory generally of everybody and everything excepting his own earlier share in the discussion of the question; in all other respects it was as hostile a speech against the Bill as could possibly be made. Every warning that could be given to the House and public had been urged by the right hon. Gentleman. He urged every objection as strongly as he possibly could, while every objection that he made would apply equally, and some more strongly, to the Bill of last year, for which the late Government was responsible, than to this measure. The right hon. Gentleman had admitted that the scheme proposed by the Bill of last year, requiring that there should be a local guarantee for the payment of interest, was utterly unworkable. The present Bill offered a different and much more valuable guarantee; but against it the right hon. Gentleman urged the dangers that would arise to England and the Treasury from that provision, forgetting that the same objections would apply even more strongly to the Bill introduced by his own Government—in fact, a more effective speech could not be made against the principle of any and every scheme for facilitating the growth of a peasant proprietary in Ireland, in its practical aspect, and of the necessity of State-aid, than that which the right hon. Gentleman, who prided himself upon being the original apostle and the present champion of the principle, had just made. It was quite true that the right hon. Gentleman, as Chairman of a Committee of which he (Mr. Plunket) was also a Member, made certain proposals with the view to creating a peasant proprietary in Ireland, and that he (Mr. Plunket) felt it his duty to oppose such proposals. He was in favour of creating a solvent peasant proprietary in Ireland, if possible; but he was free to admit that if he had known at that time what was coming in future years he should have been less careful of small dangers, and more willing to accept considerable risks, than he was at the time. He did not, however, wish to make any comparison unfavourable to the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. He fully admitted that the views of the right hon. Gentleman were then, no doubt, considerably in advance of his (Mr. Plunket's) own views with regard to a peasant proprietary. But the proposals the right hon. Gentleman then made, if carried out, would have proved utterly inadequate, as well as those would which he (Mr. Plunket) was prepared to make at that time. As to the other contentious part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech—the historical—he must just say one word. The right hon. Gentleman could not, if he tried, have more successfully thrown on the floor of the House a larger number of contentious questions, nor have offered stronger inducements to the Irish people to refuse these terms, in the hope of getting something more given them, than had been done in the speech which he had just delivered. If they were to approach the Bill in such a spirit as that, they might as well not be wasting the precious ebbing hours of the present Session upon it. In all the other speeches the question was approached in a spirit of friendliness, with the single exception of his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Dublin County (Colonel King-Harman), who had strong feelings upon it, and who had, he (Mr. Plunket) must confess, struggled manfully against the bad times which the landlords of Ireland had endured. He would not attempt to answer his hon. and gallant Friend's criticisms of the Bill. They were founded mainly on his distrust of the tribunal which was to have the working of the measure. He was sorry he could not give the House any idea as to who the new Commissioners would be, although he had no doubt that those who had framed the Bill in this large and generous spirit would be guided by the same spirit in the appointment of the Commissioners. He believed that the names of the Commissioners would be declared before the next stage of the Bill; and then, if hon. Members, like his hon. and gallant Friend, were not satisfied with those Commissioners, they might take such steps in the matter as they might think fit. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Walker) had spoken generally of this Bill with praise. There were one or two matters with which he expressed dissent, the first of which was that he did not think the Church Surplus should be applied to the purpose of the Bill. That was a very fair and clear objection for him to raise; but it should be remembered that any deficit arising by means of the Bill must be paid out of some public fund. And, if a public fund, why not an Irish fund? Then the right hon. and learned Gentleman objected that £5,000,000 was not enough to allow for the purposes of the Bill; but it must be borne in mind that it was only an experiment. If the experiments were successful, he did not believe that Parliament would hesitate to enlarge the scope of the Bill; but if the Bill was not to succeed, no question could arise as to whether the sum would be sufficient, and nothing more than the money provided by the Bill could be spent, and nothing more could be wanted. He did not wish to go through the clauses of the Bill, because they all knew it was very thoroughly threshed out in "another place;" but there seemed to be a feeling amongst some persons on one point on which he would like to say a word—namely, that this was a Landlords' Relief Bill. He would point out that the position taken up by his hon. and gallant Friend behind him (Colonel King-Harman) did not make it appear as if the Bill were, in his hon. and gallant Friend's opinion, a very large measure of landlord relief. But even he were to concede that it was, to some extent, a Landlords' Relief Bill, let the House consider the real state of the case. When the Land Act of 1881 was passed, it was admitted on all hands by its authors that the landlords of Ireland had been called upon to make great personal sacrifices for the public good; but they were told, by way of consolation, that though they might be called upon to make such sacrifices, they would get in exchange greater security and truer value in that which remained. He would put it to the House, had that promise been kept? Was it true, or was it not true, that the interest of the landlord in Ireland was at this day absolutely unsaleable? It was not only unsaleable; but it seemed to him that whatever small value it still possessed was being rapidly taken away. This had been called a Landlords' Relief Bill. Suppose there were nothing to be said, but that it was a Landlords' Relief Bill, would not there be some arguments in justice and equity for some such proposition as this? Was not the nation bound in equity and honour to fulfil the pledges on which the Land Act was passed? He did not wish to argue the Bill as a measure in the interests of any class, and more especially for the relief of the landlords. He put it on the ground that it would be a great advantage to the State, and a great advantage to all classes in Ireland, if the question could be brought to a happy and successful conclusion; a great advantage through them for this country too, which was asked at present to take a large share of the risk necessarily attendant upon such a measure. In support of his contention he claimed the authority of the late Prime Minister, the senior Member for Birmingham (Mr. John Bright), and he also claimed the authority of the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Hartington), and every great statesman who had legislated upon the Irish Question during recent years. Under those circumstances, he ventured to ask the House to take a friendly and frank view of the question; for if every person were to stand out on his own individual crotchet, and opposition was offered to it, the Bill could never pass. There must be some mutual concession. This was admitted to be a tentative measure; but now at this time, when there seemed to be a cessation of violence and animosities in Ireland, he called upon and appealed to the House to take advantage of it; and if he might be allowed, he would speak in words not only of entreaty, but in words of warning, to hon. Members of the landlord class, who might not like all that was in the Bill; he would speak, and in words of earnest appeal, to every Irishman who loved his country and desired the union of all classes in that country, to lend their aid on this occasion to the Government which had undertaken to do that of which the greatest and the severest criticism that could be uttered was that, for once, at all events, the English Government had been too generous in dealing with an Irish question.

Mr. T. A. DICKSON said, he most earnestly congratulated the Government upon the introduction of the Bill. He would point out to hon. Members that on the 15th of May the late Prime Minister announced that his Government had determined to abandon the Land Purchase Bill, and to renew the Prevention of Crime Act in some shape or form; but he (Mr. T. A. Dickson), on the following day, told the electors of County Antrim that that Session a Land Purchase Bill would be passed, and that there would be no renewal of the Prevention of Crime Act. As an Irish Liberal Member, he was extremely glad that his prophecy had been fulfilled. He was not as sanguine as the right hon. Gentleman the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir William Hart Dyke) as to the character of the measure. The right hon. Gentleman had said this was a final effort on the part of the Government to settle the Land Question; but he (Mr. T. A. Dickson) only regarded it as an experiment. The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for County Dublin (Colonel King-Harman) was not able to see any redeeming feature in the Bill. He (Mr. T. A. Dickson) thought there were three redeeming points in the measure which, if they had stood alone, were sufficient, in his opinion, to have justified its introduction. Those points were —in the first place, the Bill provided for the advance of the whole of the purchase money; in the second place, the purchase money was to be advanced at a reduced rate of interest; and, in the third place, the period of repayment was to be extended from 35 to 49 years. He confessed, however, that he was a little disappointed with the Bill in some respects, and chiefly that no reference was made to the case of the glebe tenants, of whom there were 5,000 or 6,000. There was no class of tenants in Ireland who had a stronger claim upon the consideration of the House. They bought their land, in 1869, at an extreme price. They had no option; because, if they refused to buy, they knew the land would be sold to land speculators. Mr. O'Brien, who valued the land for the Central Commission, valued the land as he found it. Indeed, he admitted, before a Select Committee of the House, that in his valuation he included the tenant's own improvements. Furthermore, the necessity was imposed upon the glebe tenants of finding one-third of the purchase money; and that they could only acquire from money lenders, at an enormous sacrifice. He (Mr. T. A. Dickson), therefore, maintained that the glebe tenants had every right to be generously and favourably considered in connection with this Bill. The hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (Colonel King-Harman) objected to the Bill because the working of it was not to be entrusted to the Landed Estates Court. He (Mr. T. A. Dickson) was glad that the Landed Estates Court was not charged with the duty of putting the Act in force, because it was a Court in which the people had no confidence; and, therefore, he thought that any such provision would be fatal to the Bill. He quite agreed with the creation of new machinery to deal solely with land purchase. The hon. and gallant Gentleman had also suggested that there should be a fining down of the rents; but the adoption of the suggestion would certainly not be satisfactory to the tenants, who were determined to be either tenants or owners. He (Mr. T. A. Dickson) quite approved of the proposal to vest the Land Commission with discretion as to whether the whole or part of the purchase money should be advanced, and would point out that, in some cases in the North of Ireland, it would be safer to advance the whole of the money than to advance half of it. In other districts he, too, was of opinion that the Bill would not be largely availed of by the tenants for some time to come; but he nevertheless thought it right, and the duty of the Government, to create proper machinery for bringing the landlord and tenant together.

Captain AYLMER said, that he had put an Amendment on the Paper, with a view to move the rejection of the Bill, for the reasons given by the right hon.

Gentleman the Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), with whom he agreed upon the subject. He would not, however, press the Amendment. At the same time, he believed there were great dangers in this Bill. The right hon. Baronet the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir William Hart Dyke) stated that the Bill had been brought in because the measures of the last 15 years had proved abortive. Now, he (Captain Aylmer) considered that the measure of 1881 was fully as liberal as any Parliament ought to grant. The failure of the Bills of the last 15 years was owing to two circumstances. In the first place, there was an extraordinary disinclination on the part of Irish tenants for some years back to become purchasers of land. He had made many inquiries, and he had come to the conclusion that they had no desire to become purchasers. The other reason for the failure was because the system of officialism and red-tapeism which prevailed in Dublin prevented purchases being carried out in any reasonable time. They had been told that this Bill had been brought forward to relieve the landlords. The Duke of Argyll, in "another place," said that, as land had been made unsaleable in Ireland, it was only just to bring in a Bill which would make it saleable. He (Captain Aylmer) himself was of opinion that the Bill would make land still more unsaleable than ever. He had the greatest wish to see peasant proprietors established in Ireland; but when they were going to make them artificially the effect would be quite the reverse of what was desired. A tenant who had to pay £100 a-year rent for land would, under the Bill, have to pay only £75 a-year for a given time. He was satisfied that when that was found to be the case the Land Courts would be unable to fix a rent of £100 a-year for that land. The effect of that would be to reduce its value. He believed the Bill was a very dangerous Bill, and that it was full of pitfalls. To make the Government the sole landlord of Ireland would be dangerous and anomalous, and put them into a position they would be sorry for. But as he felt assured that, at that late period of the Session, he would not be followed into the Lobby by more than two or three Members, he would not put the House to the trouble of a division. He thought the Government should not have interfered directly with the land, but should have endeavoured to have dealt with the question through the Land Act.

Sir THOMAS M'CLURE said, he cordially supported the Bill as a well-meant effort to remedy the present dead-lock in the land market. It was most desirable to pass a measure to facilitate the purchase of their holdings by occupiers, which had been so long promised. He would remind the House that great expectations had been founded in Ireland concerning this measure, and it would be impossible to estimate the disappointment that would follow its rejection by Parliament. The Bill was extremely liberal in its provisions. It afforded an easy means of enabling the landlord to sell who wished to do so, and the tenant to buy his property; while it brought to bear no compulsion on either party. He therefore trusted the Bill would not meet with serious opposition from any part of the House. Its principles had been advocated in Ulster by gentlemen representing both political Parties, not only on local grounds, but for high Imperial reasons. He saw there were various Amendments to be moved when the Bill got into Committee; but he would express the hope that the action of hon. Members in whose names those Amendments stood would not be allowed to delay or endanger the Bill.

Mr. MACARTNEY said, he did not entertain any very sanguine expectations of the success of the measure; but he believed it to be an honest endeavour to meet a difficulty, and he hoped it might succeed. He thought the sum of money proposed to be allocated to the purpose was sufficient. It was an experiment, and if it succeeded Parliament would be willing to increase the sum. He objected to its being supposed that this was a landlords' Bill. For the first time, he believed, in the legislation of this country, it was suggested that the seller should become security for the payment of the purchase money by the buyer. ["No, no!"] Well, he knew of no Act in which that principle was already embodied. Was it to be supposed that the tenant, who was purchasing a farm for £200, would provide the fifth part of the money, which was to remain in the hands of the Land Commissioners for 10 or 15 years? Could anyone believe that the tenant would provide the £40? Or was it to be supposed that a third party would come in between landlord and tenant and advance the money? Therefore, the security must come from the landlord. If it did not come from him, then from whom else could it come? And if the security was to be given by the landlords, what chance was there of the Bill being largely availed of? He was not at all surprised that those who held property in Ireland and England should be desirous to get rid of the Irish property. Parliament had recently inaugurated such legislation towards landed property in Ireland, and so great a depreciation in its value had resulted in consequence, that those landowners could not but think that at some future time Parliament would go still further. The landlords of Ireland might be divided into three classes. One class was nearly hopelessly insolvent, and the Bill could do no good to them. There was a second class, who were mortgaged heavily, but not too deeply. But they were mortgaged sufficiently deeply as, with the assistance of the late legislation, to put them in a very precarious position, and leave them a very small margin to live upon. Unless these men got a fair price for their land they could not live. The third class, who would avail themselves of the Bill, would be comparatively small in number. The position of Irish landlords for many years past had been anything but agreeable. They had been deprived of their former position, and now they saw Parliament year by year reducing the amount of their rent. It had been said that it was difficult to explain why land was unsaleable in Ireland. To him the explanation was very simple. It was because of the constant, persistent, and determined agitation kept up by hon. Gentlemen opposite below the Opposition Gangway. No matter what Act was passed embodying concessions, they immediately began agitating for a further one. They were now apparently sitting in a most demure, lamb-like attitude; but when this Bill was passed they would shortly disperse themselves over Ireland and use language not at all suited to the very quiet position they now assumed against those robbers, rascals, and murderers, the landowners. They would, no doubt, be yet heard to say to those who came to hear them—"What do you think Parliament has done? Parliament has given the landlords the full value of their land. Will you stand that?" Of course, the answer would be "No, no!" And they would also be asked not to be such fools as to give any money to the landlords, when they might get all they wanted and reach their desired end by following the lead of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). They would be asked, why put money in the hands of those rascally landlords? Now, what was this proposal? He would examine it briefly. It was, he believed, in effect, that, by purchasing under the Act, every tenant should not only get his own holding, but also a slice of somebody else's grass land. The House must know that on many estates in Ireland there were tenants who had large farms, chiefly grass lands, and these were to be found in Meath, Mayo, and Galway. These large tenants, as he understood it, would, under the operation of the Act, be ousted, and slices of these large holdings would be given to the small tenants. If the House of Commons sanctioned anything like that, he could assure them that there would be much indignation in Ireland. He should be extremely glad to see the Bill succeed; but he hoped that what had been said by the hon. Member for Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) and other hon. Members would be considered by the Government, and that was to afford some relief to those glebe tenants who came in and purchased under the Act of 1869. Those tenants purchased at an extremely high rate—24 or 25 years' purchase—those terms having been made by the officials of the Church Commissioners, who went round and valued, and made the tenants pay through the nose for it. These glebe tenants were bound under very strict terms, and if they failed at the end of a half-year to pay their instalments they received notice that legal proceedings would be taken against them. He believed that many of them had borrowed, not only the fourth part of the purchase money which they originally paid down, but had also been obliged to borrow since to pay up their instalments. They were, therefore, heavily charged with debt, and the future in store for them was a very gloomy one indeed. The position of those tenants would be a most anomalous one if they were not included in the Bill, for they would be shut out from the benefits of recent legislation and become so many pariahs, so to say. Later on in Committee he (Mr. Macartney), if no one else did, would make a proposal respecting these tenants, which he hoped the Government would accept, as it would bring these glebe tenants under the Bill.

Mr. PARNELL: I am very glad to see that the opposition of the Irish landlords, as represented by the hon. and gallant Member for the County Dublin (Colonel King-Harman) and the hon. and gallant Member for Maidstone (Captain Aylmer), is not a real or sincere one, and that it has come to an end; because I think it would have been a misfortune if this Bill, subject to some Amendments, were not to be passed into law this Session. There seems to be a dispute as to whether the Bill is more in favour of the landlords or of the tenants; and I am bound to say that the action of hon. Gentlemen who put down Amendments to the Bill, and then retreat from those Amendments, shows that, in their opinion, they consider the measure is likely to be more in favour of the landlords than of the tenants. However, I do not propose myself to express any opinion upon that point, and will only say that the Bill appears to me to offer facilities to the landlord who is not able to sell his land and who desires to do so, to find a purchaser for it; and it also appears to me to offer facilities to a tenant who is desirous of buying his land to purchase it if he wishes to do so. For the rest I will only say that, judging by public indications and appearances, the Irish landowners are looking, more than the Irish tenants, for help from a measure of this kind; and I cannot help thinking that their attitude is a wise one, and that if they had adopted this attitude some years ago, however much worse it might have been for the tenants, it certainly would not have been any the worse for themselves. Taking the whole case as it stands, looking at the Bill merely as experimental, involving only the expenditure of a comparatively small sum of money—£5,000,000 sterling—I cannot see that very much mischief can be done, either to Irish landlords or to Irish tenants, by its passage; whereas, on the other hand, some knowledge may come to us, from the experience derived in its working, which may tempt all parties interested in the question—the tenants, the Government, and the landowners—to go further in the future, and perhaps to arrive at a final solution of this very important and difficult Land Question in Ireland. With regard to the details of the Bill to which I object, I would simply say this—that I cannot understand why the Government desire to take from us the only public fund we have left in Ireland, the only money that we have left for any purpose whatever, for the purpose of providing an additional security to those securities which already exist in abundance. If you give the Land Commission, the body which is to be entrusted, practically speaking, with lending the money to those desirous of purchasing, and, therefore, practically speaking, entrusted with the duty of preventing too high a price from being given; if you give to them the Church Fund to fall back upon as an extra security, the inevitable tendency will be to allow higher prices to be paid for farms than prudence would dictate—the Land Commission will, under those circumstances, look less closely into the security and into its nature. They will say that, as regards that portion of the purchase money, they have an absolutely unimpeachable security to fall back upon; and the necessary consequence will be that the Land Commission will be inclined to give a higher price, or, rather, allow a higher price to be given to the landowner than the circumstances of the time and other matters would prudently permit. The same thing applies to the retention of one-fifth of the purchase money. If that provision be left in the Bill, it will inevitably form a bone of contention between the tenant and the landlord. There will be a tendency, undoubtedly, upon the part of the tenants to look upon that one-fifth as a portion which ought to be discharged by the landlord and not by the tenant; there will be the tendency on their part to borrow on the land more than it is entitled to by that operation, and to turn over to the landowner the loss involved to that extent. I think it would be far better for the Government to place the Land Commission in the position of having to scrutinize narrowly the security that may be offered them, and the price that will have to be paid, with the understanding, on the part of the tenants, that the price they now say they are willing to give for their holdings, and the annual instalments necessitated by that price, will be strictly demanded from them in the future. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Tyrone (Mr. Macartney), who last spoke, said that many of us do not desire the landowners to get anything at all for their land. [Mr. MACARTNEY: Hear, hear!] I will tell the hon. Gentleman what I desire in reference to this matter. I desire that the tenants should not pay anything more than they are perfectly certain to be able to continue the payment of to the State as annual instalments hereafter; and I think that tenants purchasing in these times, when there is so great a depreciation in the price of agricultural produce, that the only remaining articles of produce, butter and cattle, have fallen in value 50 per cent within the last 12 months, when we see that the bottom of the fall has not apparently been reached, and that the downward process is still continuing—I say, in the interests of public honour and morality, in the interests of the State and of the taxpayers of this country, as well as in the interests of the tenants themselves, we should warn them not to incur liabilities which they may be unable hereafter to fulfil. Let them pay, by all means, a fair price for their holdings; but let them not be tempted to undertake annual payments which, from the depreciation in the price of farm produce, it may be absolutely impossible for them to pay. That is the view that I take of this question of purchase. I have always held, since making my entry into public life, that it is eminently desirable that the Irish Land Question should be settled permanently upon the basis of an occupying ownership. My mind has not at all been altered by the passage of the Land Act of 1881. I do not think that the Irish tenants are to be blamed for failing to purchase their holdings. Up to the present moment they have been occupied in getting their rents fixed in the Land Court; and immediately after the rents have been fixed has come this great depression in the prices of agricultural produce, which will undoubtedly make it exceedingly difficult for many of the tenants, if the depression remains permanent, to pay the judicial rents. Therefore there is further need of caution and deliberation on their part before they purchase and involve the State in their misfortunes. At present it is the Irish landlords and the Irish tenants who have to face this question of agricultural depression; and if you leave in the Bill inducements, such as the security of the Church Funds, or the retention of one-fifth, you inevitably offer inducements to all parties to agree to the paying of too high a figure for the land; and if the holdings are purchased at too high a price the difficulties of the tenant will be proportionately increased, and that may be the result of offering the further guarantee. As this is to be an experimental measure only tentatively dealing with the question, and as possibly larger, much larger, measures may hereafter spring out of it, if it succeeds, I am obliged to feel the greatest anxiety that, whatever is done under this Bill, if it become an Act, should be done well, and that no loss should result to the public from the expenditure of these millions of money. It is evident, if the Land Question is to be settled on the basis of purchase, the advance by the State will have to be very large; and it would be a very poor encouragement for the English taxpayers and Irish farmers if any of the provisions of the Bill were, under the surrounding circumstances in Ireland, to tempt the latter to pay an impossible price for their holdings, a price at which they would not be able to keep up the annual instalments hereafter; and I hope, therefore, there will be no attempt on the part of the Land Judges to bolster up the value of land artificially, or to refuse fair and reasonable offers from the tenants of those encumbered estates in Ireland with regard to the purchase of their holdings. I think the Irish tenants should be treated, at least, as reasonably in this matter as the land jobbers were in the bad times of 1847 and 1848. There was then no attempt on the part of the Land Judges artificially to bolster up the price of land, and estates were put up in the open market, and knocked down to the highest bidder. I think that should be to some extent the case on the present occasion. If that principle be adopted now, and tenants are tempted to come forward, I have no doubt that the deadlock in the land market will soon be terminated, and such prices will be given by the tenants for their holdings as will be fair, and as will render it possible that they will have a reasonable hope of being able to pay hereafter the instalments fixed upon. Another matter was mentioned in the course of this discussion which I should like to allude to. It is the important question of the glebe tenants. Appeals have been made by hon. Gentlemen on both sides of the House that the purchasers under the Church Act, who bought their holdings at a much higher rate than those contemplated by this Bill, should be put in the same position as purchasers under this Bill. Now, these purchasers were divided into two classes—there were persons who came forward and bought land over the heads of the tenants in the open market, and who were assisted by the funds of the State to do so, and there were those *bonâ fide* tenants who purchased their own holdings. In respect of the first class of persons, I do not see how you can fairly ask that a Bill, which is intended to enable tenants to become the owners of their holdings on more reasonable terms, should be so stretched in its provisions so as to enable land speculators, admittedly men who bought land in the open market as an investment and speculation, to obtain better terms than those bargained for. On the other hand, I admit I should be very glad if the Government could see their way to give *bonâ fide* occupying tenants who purchased under the provisions of the Irish Church Act the same terms that this Bill proposes to give. These tenants undoubtedly bought at a very high price — occupying tenants bought, I think, at an average of two years' higher purchase than the ordinary purchaser gave for the same class of land at the time. I think that ordinary purchasers who were not tenants bought on an average of 22 or 22½ years' purchase, and I think the occupying tenants were obliged to pay 23½ or 24 years' purchase. In that way they paid a higher price, and their annual instalments were higher. However, I would certainly not reduce in any way the terms they have covenanted to give; but I would give them the advantages of this Bill, so far as the terms of repayment go and the interest. In this way you could gradually lighten the very heavy burden which they are suffering from. From 24 and 23½ years' purchase a lower price has ensued, which has gone down to 20 years' purchase. I do not think, therefore, you ought to reduce the amount of purchase money which they consented to give, because the fund that you gave it to is a public one. But neither the Imperial Exchequer nor the Church Fund need suffer in the slightest degree by the interest on the purchase money being reduced, as it may be, by an arrangement between the Treasury and the Church Commissioners, to enable the Church Commissioners to borrow at the lower rate provided for in this Bill. I am glad that there has been no political acrimony excited by the introduction of the measure. I am also glad to see that the Conservative Party have so far been educated on the Land Question as—I will not say to settle it on the lines of the Land League, because this very small measure of £5,000,000 sterling cannot be considered in any sense as even an attempt to settle the Land Question—I would, however, remind the House that the much-abused Land League was formed first to do away with rack rents and prevent landlord oppression and eviction; and, secondly, to enable every occupying tenant to become the owner of his holding upon fair terms, objects for which no abuse or ridicule was thought to be too strong at the time, but which, I am glad to say, now appear to be becoming rapidly absorbed into the political creed of the Conservative Party. I trust that this Bill, so far as it goes and when amended, may enable the tenants to become the owners of their holdings.

Mr. CLARE READ said, that, as an English county Member, he must excuse himself for speaking on the subject of the Bill, upon the ground that for 15 years he had not uttered a word in that House on the Irish Land Question. When the Land Bill of 1870 was introduced, he endeavoured to prove that, instead of extending the Ulster tenant right to the whole of Ireland, they ought to go in at once for State-aided peasant proprietorship. That he was right at that time was evident from the fact that after experiencing the working of the Acts of 1870 and 1881, they had found it would be much better that there should be a solid landed proprietorship, and that those who cultivated should own the land, rather than there should be a sort of bastard ownership which had existed during the last 15 years. At the same time, unless those who purchased their holdings showed a greater amount of assiduity and hard work than he thought was generally practised by some of the small tenants of Ireland, he feared that they would not succeed as well as the House desired. There could not be a worse system than prevailed in Ireland at present, as far as concerned the interests of both landlord and tenant. Irish tenants, with the exception of those who first acquired the tenant right, were really under two rents; for the interest of the money locked up in the purchase of the tenant right was a second rent paid by the tenant from which he could not escape, and the liability passed from one occupier to another. The hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. Macartney) had told them that, in some instances, the tenant right was worth more than the fee simple. There were three interests involved in the cultivation of land, although they might all exist, in some instances, in the same person. There was the man who supplied the dead capital, the man who supplied the working capital, and the man who did the labour. All three might be rolled into one—the peasant proprietor —but still they must co-exist. However well he might cultivate the land, the only way in which a small farmer, whether owner or occupier, could succeed, was to do the work of two agricultural labourers and live at the expense of one. In that case, if the Irish peasant could fulfil those conditions, the Bill might be a success. There was much point in the remarks of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) with respect to a probable fall in prices. The hon. Member had said that, in the last few few months, stock had fallen 50 per cent. He (Mr. Clare Read) was not aware of any such fall in England, though prices had undoubtedly gone down. But in this there lay a great danger, and in a few years the purchasing tenants might find themselves as owners in a much worse condition than their tenant neighbours. He believed the Bill was the only possible corollary to the two Irish Land Acts; but he could not endorse its principle, nor could he give it support upon any ground of political economy; but as to its expediency there could be no doubt. Therefore, under the present circumstances, he hoped it would become law as speedily as possible, although it would add another page to our history, whereby the State would become, in a more real sense than ever, the father of the people.

MR. THOMASSON said, that he shared in the anxiety of the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) lest tenants under this Bill should engage to pay too high rents for the next 49 years. Even if the freehold were bought at 20 years' purchase, the tenant would pay less than his present rent by way of instalments, and in about 10 years the State would lose the security of one-fifth the price deposited at the time of the purchase. Then, about the same period, would come the revision of rents, as the 15 years' term of judicial rent would then be on the point of expiration. If rents should then be still further reduced, serious discontent would arise among the purchasers under the present Bill, for the tenants who took advantage of it, and bound themselves for 49 years to pay a certain rent to the State, might find themselves in a very much worse position than those of their neighbours who might have their rents considerably reduced. That being the case, there would be great danger that the State would not receive the rents agreed upon, so that the loss would fall upon the British taxpayers. ["Oh, oh!"] As an English Member, he was entitled to take into consideration the possible effect of the Bill upon the British taxpayers. The right hon. Baronet the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) had hinted at the possibility of an increase of the duty on tea; and it was possible that every householder in the town he (Mr. Thomasson) represented, and in the Kingdom also, might hereafter find that he had to pay an increased duty upon that article in order to make up the loss to the Exchequer from the failure of Irish tenants to perform their contracts. Many of these householders were women, who were unrepresented, but whose interests the House ought not the less to consider. The State was running a great risk in this Bill. It was buying a rent charge of $3\frac{1}{8}$ per cent, while running the risk that in 10 years' time the rents on which it was based would not be paid. He was afraid that the worst of such a state of things would be that the idle and thriftless among the tenants would be benefited at the expense of the more industrious and of the English taxpayer, and that the measure would produce discontent in Ireland. He would much rather that the rents of the industrious tenants who had invested their money in their farms should be reduced by a revision of the Healy Clause of the Land Act than that the question should be dealt with as was proposed under this Bill. It had been frequently remarked that the Bill was merely an experimental, and not a final one; but, in his opinion, there had been more than enough of experiments of this nature, and he was afraid that considerable danger might result from the measure. For instance, if it were largely taken advantage of, the State would become the landlord of a large part of Ireland, which was a most undesirable position for the State to be in, as it would have to exact the rents to the uttermost farthing in justice to the British taxpayer, which would increase the difficulties, already great, of governing the country. It would, in his opinion, be wiser not to try any further experiments in this direction, but to have postponed the consideration of a measure dealing with such large, important, and complicated interests, leaving the question to be dealt with by the new Parliament if it was considered that the present Parliament had not solved it satisfactorily.

Sir HERVEY BRUCE said, he rose to express a hope that whoever concluded the debate on the part of the Government would give the House some assurance that those landowners who purchased their land for residential and not for speculative purposes under the provisions of the Act of 1870, and also the purchasers of glebe lands, would be favourably considered under the Bill. He thought, however, that, in respect to those persons, the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) was quite right in drawing a line of distinction between those who bought land for speculation and tenants who *bonâ fide* purchased their holdings. The latter, it seemed to him (Sir Hervey Bruce), deserved the same treatment as if they had purchased now. He was glad that the Bill had been introduced by the present Government; for, although he did not think it by any means a perfect Bill, or one which would at once solve the problem of the Irish Land Question, still it was the thin edge of the wedge, which might be driven home until better relations were established between landlords and tenants in Ireland. Indeed, he thought that if the sentiments and opinions contained in the speech of the hon. Member for the City of Cork were carried out the Bill might be the beginning of better days for Ireland, by doing much to place the Land Question in that country upon a more satisfactory footing.

Mr. FINDLATER said, he most heartily approved of the Bill, which, in his opinion, would confer a great boon upon the people of Ireland. Its provisions were good, and with some slight but necessary Amendments it might be made a good working measure. In the belief that it would be a boon to both parties, he desired to see it pass as soon as possible; and, so far as he was concerned, he would aid its passage by making it as perfect as possible. With that object he should make several suggestions to the Government when the Bill reached the Committee stage.

Mr. GREGORY said, he hoped that before the debate closed Her Majesty's Government would announce their intention of standing by their proposal to reserve one-fifth of the purchase money. After the best consideration he could give to the subject, he did not think the Government would be justified, considering their duty to the country, in giving up the security constituted by the retention of that money. It must be remembered that the terms offered by the Government in this Bill were of perfectly unexampled liberality. No company or association of capitalists in the City of London would advance money on such terms. By the Bill money was to be advanced for the purchasers under it at 4 per cent, which was not merely interest, but sinking fund; whereas he ventured to assert, with great confidence, that no one would lend money on an Irish security under 5 per cent for interest alone. That being so, the Government were entitled to have every possible security for the repayment of their advances; nay, more, they were bound to demand it, for they were Trustees of the public, whose interest they were bound to protect. Their duty involved the exaction of a proper guarantee for their advances. What, then, was the guarantee which the Bill provided? It was simply the retention of a certain amount of the purchase money. During the 10 years the portion of the purchase money thus retained could be assigned, charged, or otherwise made available as a security by the person to whom it belonged. He did not think that an unfair arrangement; and, in the interest of the taxpayer, he thought it ought to be maintained. He would again repeat the hope that before the debate closed they would have some assurance from the Government, and it would be maintained. Then as to mortgages, which were one of the difficulties he saw in the working of the measure, the Government might desire to purchase certain portions of a mortgaged estate. If they paid the money to the landlord, the estate would not thereby be discharged from the mortgage. The Government would have to consider how that was to be met, and he thought they would have to place themselves in such cases in the position of the mortgagee, by paying off the mortgage and taking an assignment of it. He wished every success to the measure; but he was not very sanguine as to the results that would flow from it. He hoped it would lead to a settlement of the Land Question in Ireland; but he was afraid that it would only increase the demands of the tenants, to whom so much had been given. Ten years hence, when rents were revised, as they were to be under the Land Act of the late Government, they might be reduced; and then the tenants who had purchased under that Bill on the basis of the existing rents might think that they had made a bad bargain, and had paid too much, and in that case there might be a revival of irritation and discontent. That, however, to a great extent, was a matter of speculation, and, at all events, of opinion. What he confessed did seem to him certain was that the Government were bound by their duty to the taxpayer of this country to take every precaution that no loss to him should accrue from the present measure.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he thought the Government might feel satisfied with the almost unanimous approval with which the Bill had been received by Irish Members on both sides of the House; and, so far as the criticism which had been passed upon it was concerned, it would encourage them to press the Bill on with as much expedition as possible. He thought the discussion had given the Government some assistance in carrying out their Bill. It was not his intention to enter into the details; but he wished to state what would be probably the views entertained by the Government of the suggestions which had been made. The Bill dealt with the question from two points of view. It dealt first with the machinery by which it was expected that the tenant might be able to secure the fee simple of his holding; and, in the second place, with the means by which he could procure the purchase money. As to the first point—the machinery—that was to say, the tribunal to which the carrying out of the measure was to be entrusted—he could not agree with his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Dublin County (Colonel King-Harman) that it would be wise to place the duty on the old Landed Estates Court. He admitted that it was a Court fully competent to deal with this question; but without, in any way, speaking to its disparagement, he could not help feeling that the measure would not be carried out as well, if left to that Court, as if it were entrusted to the Special Commissioners who would be appointed under the Bill. The Judges and officers of the Landed Estates Court were in the habit of trying large cases; and it was not to be expected that they, who were mainly engaged in dealing with large estates, would be able to descend and adjudicate upon matters connected with the transfer of the small holdings between landlords and tenants. Then, if the Government left it in the hands of the Land Commissioners in Ireland, he did not think the Bill would be carried out very vigorously; because they had already in hand more work than they would be able to do in an effective way in the ordinary course of their duties. They were appointed originally to fix the rent of land between the landlord and the tenant; and they had large arrears of work on hand, which they were not likely to get rid of for a long time to come. Under all those circumstances, the Government thought it best to appoint two Commissioners, to form a special tribunal for carrying out this measure. Objection had been taken because their names had not been published to the House. Before the second reading of a Bill was surely not the time to announce the names of the gentlemen whose appointment depended solely upon the passing of that Bill. Before a position of this kind could be accepted by a gentleman with credit to himself, he must have an assurance that the Government were in earnest and would pass the Bill. Under the Land Act of 1881, the names of the Commissioners were not announced until after a later stage than that at which he hoped to mention the names of the two gentlemen who would be selected under the Bill. As the Government were anxious that the Bill should be efficiently carried out, the House could rest assured that they would only appoint gentlemen who were fully qualified to discharge their duties zealously and with ability, and who would receive and retain the confidence of the public and of the Executive. There was a provision of the Bill which had not been referred to, and which he considered a very valuable one. The Executive had taken power to transfer some of the officers from the Landed Estates Court to the Land Commission, for the purpose of carrying out the investigation of titles. These officials would bring a large amount of accumulated knowledge to the work. As to the provision which the Bill made for enabling the tenant to purchase, reference had been made to the guarantee as a condition precedent to the purchase money being advanced. It was obvious that the State ought to be in a position, when enabling tenants to purchase their holdings, to take care that it should be protected from loss, especially when it was advancing so much as £5,000,000. It would be a rash and imprudent thing to ask that the advance should be made, unless there was some guarantee that the State should not suffer. They had made two provisions in this regard; one was that the vendor should allow a part of the money to remain in the hands of the Commissioners. But this would only remain till such time as the purchaser had paid instalments equal to the amount left by the vendor. The tenant's interest would then become the guarantee. When they asked that this one-fifth was to be retained, they did not ask that it should be retained without making some return to the landlord or the vendor. He would be paid at the rate of 3 per cent, and at the same time he would not be entirely deprived of the use of his capital; for if the country was prosperous, and the tenant paid up his instalments punctually, the landlord could raise money on the security of that fifth which had been retained; so that, while it was being retained by the State as a security, he would be receiving an advantage from it, and would be enjoying it. With reference to the next guarantee, the Church Surplus Fund, there had been some adverse criticism. The sum now vested in the Church Temporalities Commission amounted to something between £600,000 and £700,000. He hoped it would not be necessary to resort to that at all, and that this fund would still remain for such National purposes as Parliament might be disposed to apply it to. Should it, unfortunately, be necessary to use it, it seemed to him, and to the Government as well, that it was a most natural thing to apply this National Irish Fund to an Irish object when required. Adverse criticism came principally from his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Dublin County, who had declared that the Bill was likely to be abortive, or a "sham," as he described it; but there was one answer to his criticism about the £5,000,000. They must remember that they were now at the end of a Parliament, and on the eve of a General Election, and they would shortly have a Parliament elected by different constituencies to those which had hitherto elected Members, and it would not be desirable to apply a larger amount of State funds than was likely to be absorbed in the interim. If the Bill was a success, he believed there would be no difficulty in getting further funds. He wished to make one other remark, and that had reference to the tenants who had already purchased under the Acts of 1870 and 1881, also the glebe tenants who purchased under the Church Act of 1869. He assured hon. Members that this matter had received the consideration of the Government; but the more they considered it the greater were the difficulties which confronted them. It would always be an argument against doing anything to say that there was a certain number of others who had purchased in antecedent years under other circumstances. The tenants who purchased under the Acts he had referred to paid their purchase money under the law as it existed. It would be wholly impossible for the Government to reduce the amounts paid by those tenants, and he thought there would be the greatest difficulty in reducing the interest. No doubt, however, something might be done, and it was a matter which would continue to receive the earnest attention of the Government. It had been said by some that this was a landlords' Bill, and by others that it was a tenants' Bill. It appeared to him that the great recommendation of the Bill was that it was neither a landlords' Bill nor a tenants' Bill, but that it was a Bill from which both landlords and tenants might derive certain advantages if they availed themselves of it. He wished to point out, what had been already pointed out by the hon. Members for County Londonderry (Mr. Lewis) and for Monaghan (Mr. Findlater), that although this Bill might not be perfect in every part, yet if the House approved the principle the best way to allow the principle to be carried out was to permit the Bill to pass a second reading, and to make such Amendments as were necessary in Committee. A Bill might be killed either by active opposition or by protracted discussion; but he hoped that hon. Members would see in this Bill the germ of an earnest effort to do something for Ireland, and would therefore withdraw their opposition in order that its merits might be tested, and that, therefore, they would permit the Bill to pass. As he had been permitted to say so much, he might, perhaps, add a hope that as the House had now spent a very considerable time in discussing the principle of the measure, and as the Government intended to put down the next stage for an early day, hon. Members would now allow the discussion to cease, and the second reading of the Bill to be taken.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH: I wish to congratulate the House on the introduction of this Bill, and I do so as representing a constituency having a large Irish population, in whom I take a very keen interest. The Bill is a generous Bill, and in that respect it is politic, for all legislation dealing with Ireland, in order to be politic, ought to be generous. The Bill, in my opinion, also contains within itself the seeds of something like a final settlement of the Irish difficulty as regards the Land Question. I especially congratulate the House upon the very friendly way in which the Bill has been received by all sections of opinion, and especially by the section which is led by the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell). I do not think we can too highly congratulate, both ourselves and the country at large, upon the great change in the tone of Irish opinion in this House. It is a matter for very hearty congratulation that we have at last reached a method of speaking about Irish questions which is a great deal more rational than what has been the custom for many years past. I believe, myself, that if this Bill is heartily accepted by the Members of the Party who follow the lead of the hon. Member for the City of Cork, it will pave the way, at no distant date, for a very wide extension of its terms. It, no doubt, is an experiment; but that experiment may be developed to a very large degree, and may become the means of settling the controversy about the land in Ireland. I wish to say how entirely I approve of the measure, and how heartily, speaking from the Liberal side of the House, I wish it God-speed. I think it is a thoroughly wise measure. It has already produced excellent effects on public opinion, and I join with all who have discussed this subject in hoping and trusting that it will turn out to be a solution of one of the greatest—if not the very greatest—of Irish difficulties.

MR. BIGGAR said, that if the Bill were intended to be the beginning of the general purchase of their holdings by tenants, it was unreasonable to suppose that the Church Surplus would offer any security for the payment. It might be a valuable security if the purchases were not to exceed £5,000,000; but it would be of no value if the Bill were extended beyond that. He considered the Bill carried out the principles of the National League, therefore he was very anxious that it should succeed; but its success depended not so much upon what was in the Bill as upon its administration. He also thought that what the Government ought to do was to regard the measure as an experiment, a commencement with the question of Land Purchase, and should give the Commissioners instructions that they must, if possible, conduct the business in such a way as to deal with the whole of this £5,000,000 of property within the next three months after the Bill had become law. If the Commissioners waited till the landlords could screw an extravagant price from their tenants no business would be done. He believed that many tenants wished to buy their holdings; but they wanted to buy as cheap as they could. He thought that the first transactions ought to take place at the present price, and a beginning might be made by the new Commissioners buying properties which had been some time in the Landed Estates Court.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *Friday.*

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF AUSTRALASIA BILL [*Lords*].

(*Secretary Colonel Stanley.*)

[BILL 165.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Secretary Colonel Stanley.*)

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that he was very much inclined to think that the people who called themselves the Colonists were but a very small number of persons at either end of the telegraph wire leading to Australia, and he had seen papers which led him very greatly to doubt if the Australian Colonists really wanted this Bill. If the Australian Colonies saw their way to any complete scheme of federation he wished them God-speed. He knew, however, that New South Wales and New Zealand had both declared their dislike to the Bill and their intention not to accept it; and it was, therefore, very doubtful whether it was worth while for Her Majesty's Government to proceed with the measure. It was for that reason that he had blocked it. Personally, he did not object to the Bill, with one important exception, and he should be glad to see the Australian Colonies and Her Majesty's Government settle the matter between them. But he decidedly objected to that clause in the Bill which enabled the Australasian Colonies to deal with what was called the relations of Australia to the Islands of the Pacific. He did not know what was meant by that expression; but he had very grave doubts whether it was prudent to put such a provision in the Bill. Dealing with the question of New Guinea and the disputes which had occurred with regard to the Islands of the Pacific, he must be allowed to express the opinion that it would be imprudent to give to Australia, so long as it remained under the British flag, the power to assume protection over the Natives of the Islands of the Pacific. The alienation between this country and Germany took place with reference to the excessive pretensions of Queensland to deal with one of the Pacific Islands. He believed that the Australians would be much better off if they followed the example of the American Colonies, and developed their own territories, and did all that it was possible for them to do in that direction, without seeking foreign possessions, and endeavouring to entangle themselves in foreign complications.

MR. BRYCE said, he much regretted that a Bill of that importance should have been brought before the notice of the House on such scanty information, and when hon. Members were in possession of so little information as to the sentiments of the Colonies themselves. It was true that a certain number of Parliamentary Papers had been presented; but the information which they contained was, he thought, hardly sufficient to enable the House to appreciate the whole bearings of the question, and to understand what were the feelings with which the proposals had been received in the Colonies during the last few months. He thought it would have been valuable to the House if the Colonial Office had prepared a sort of explanatory Memorandum giving a view of the whole matter and a justification of the whole Bill. When the House of Commons was asked to undertake a function so large as that of drawing up a Constitution for communities already great, and which were likely to become infinitely greater in the future, it ought to approach a task of that kind with a due sense of responsibility and on accurate information and knowledge. He thought also there was no evidence to show that this Bill, or draft Constitution, had really been satisfactorily discussed and considered in the Colonies themselves. It appeared to have emanated in the first instance from a small coterie or conclave of Prime Ministers, and the House had nothing to show them that the best minds of our Colonies had been properly brought to bear in the consideration of the subject. The Bill would have come before the House with greater authority if it had reason to believe that proper pains had been bestowed upon it, and that proper efforts had been made to obtain full publicity and discussion for it in the Australian Colonies themselves. He thought that the circumstances he had mentioned made the position of the Imperial Parliament not quite a satisfactory one in dealing with this matter. In considering the character of the Bill, and its liability to a certain line of criticism, he said it was clear that it was a very scanty, fragmentary, and imperfect sketch of a Federal Constitution. Looking even at that important clause which provided that any one Colony could withdraw from the federation, he said if the House were free to debate the subject at length a great deal of time might be spent over the consideration of this clause alone; because a federation, which offered to any member of it the right to withdraw as soon as its wishes were not gratified, was clearly a federation of the feeblest and most transitory kind. He was content, however, that they should pass the Bill in the form in which the Colonial authorities had asked us to do so, and as a matter of favour to them; but the responsibility for its formation would substantially rest more with them than with us. He looked with more hope to the establishment of closer relations between the Executive authority here and the Colonies than to a federation among the Colonies themselves. The real value of this Constitution seemed to him to lie in the provision which it made for the introduction of uniform legislation among the different Colonies, and particularly for the introduction of a uniform system of legal process and of private law in those matters in which the inhabitants of different Colonies were most likely to come into relation with one another. The experience of the United States, which was the great source of experience in these matters, showed how much advantage there was in having—how much might be lost by not having—a uniform system of legislation on certain subjects of common interest. It would be, for instance, of immense advantage for the United States to have a uniform Law of Marriage and Divorce. It was one of the great difficulties which legal reformers had to deal with in America; and he was glad to see that the Federal Council, under this Bill, had power to legislate on these subjects, on quarantine, on bills of exchange, and other such matters. As regarded the utility of the Federal Legislature, if he might so call it, for the purpose of introducing a uniform system of private law, he thought it would be very desirable to increase the size of the Council, for he thought, as at present devised, it was too small for the adequate discussion of the subjects with which it would have to deal. But in that, as in other respects, he looked upon the Bill more as a first sketch than as a complete Constitution; and he could not help believing that further legislation would be required, and that the outline contained in that measure would have hereafter to be filled up and developed in various particulars.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 14, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 15 (Matters subject to legislative authority of Council).

Mr. BRYCE said, he wished, after the word "copyright," in line 41, to have the word "bankruptcy" inserted. It was true that unless the right hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Stanley) were favourable to this Amendment it would not be of use for him to propose it; but he wished to point out that bankruptcy was a subject upon which, of all others, it was desirable that there should be uniformity of legislation as between the different States. If the right hon. and gallant Gentleman did not object to this proposal, he would suggest to him that the word "bankruptcy" might be properly included in the clause.

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 41, after the word "copyright," to insert the word "bankruptcy."—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'bankruptcy' be there inserted."

The SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (Colonel Stanley) said, he thought he could undertake that the attention of the Federal Council should be directed to the question raised by the Amendment of the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce); but he would venture to ask the hon. Member not to press the Amendment. If the hon. Member would look to Clause 4 he would find that there was power to refer to the Council any matter of general interest, and that, therefore, the subject of the Amendment was already within the scope of the Bill.

Mr. BRYCE said, he admitted that it was within the scope of the Bill. He thought it desirable, however, to emphasize the particular subject of bankruptcy for the reason he had given; but after the expression of opinion on the part of the right hon. and gallant Gentleman, he had no objection, with the permission of the Committee, to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 16 and 17 *agreed to.*

Clause 18 (Power to Her Majesty to disallow Act to which Governor has assented in Her Majesty's name).

Mr. BRYCE said, he had placed on the Paper an Amendment which was intended to make the clause clearer in respect of acts done between the date of assent and the time of annulment. He apprehended that upon a strict legal construction of the clause a Court of Law would hold that an act done between the date of giving assent and the date of annulment would be protected. Subject to the opinion of the hon. and learned Solicitor General he thought that would be so; but he also thought it would be worth while to make the matter quite clear, so that acts done after assent given by the Colonial Government would be certain of being protected. If the right hon. and gallant Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Colonies did not object, he should like to have the words of his Amendment introduced into the clause.

Amendment proposed,

In page 4, at end, add—"But without prejudice to any act done or right acquired between the date of such assent and the day of such signification of annulment."—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

The SECRETARY of STATE (Colonel Stanley) said, he regretted very much to have to ask the hon. Member (Mr. Bryce) not to press this Amendment. He thought it would be premature to deal with the question; and he was afraid, if these words were to be put into the Act, that it might lead to the presumption that the rule hitherto existing had been disturbed. He understood that the Amendment might draw a distinction between the custom prevailing in one Colony and the customs prevailing in others. For that reason, and because he thought the Acts in question would be protected by the clause as it stood, he asked the hon. Member not to press the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clauses 19 to 28, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 29 (Power to determine operation of Act in any Colony).

The SECRETARY of STATE (Colonel Stanley) said, he regretted that the Amendment he was about to ask the Committee to assent to was not upon the Notice Paper. He understood that his Predecessor in Office had given a promise that the words after "Council" to the end of the clause should be omitted, and others substituted relating to the repeal of certain Acts. It had been held that it would be distinctly productive of harm if a law, passed by the assent of the Colonies united in Council, should be repealed by a particular Colony, which might be the Colony in respect of which that law was originally passed by the Federal Council. In moving this Amendment, he pointed out that power was taken providing that no assent would be given to any Act which did not contain proper safeguards for all that might take place under the provisions of this clause.

Amendment proposed,

In page 6, to omit all the words after "Council" to the end of the Clause, in order to insert "unless altered or repealed by the Council."—(*Colonel Stanley.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Preamble.

Mr. W. E. FORSTER said, he had no wish to delay the further consideration of the Bill; but he might be allowed to remark that this was a very tentative measure. He was not sure, however, that it would be less likely to succeed on that account. He thought he should be expressing the general feeling of the

Committee by expressing regret that the most important of the Australasian Colonies — New South Wales and New Zealand—were not included in the Bill, because he thought that nothing like a complete federation policy could be obtained without those two Colonies giving their adhesion to it. He thought, however, that their union with the Colonies could not be injured or damaged by the confederation of the Colonies amongst themselves, and that the tentative way in which the Bill had been passed would conduce to all the Colonies joining in the movement hereafter, which would be lasting, and for the good of the whole.

Preamble *agreed to.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

SECRETARY FOR SCOTLAND BILL

[*Lords.*]--[BILL 242.]

(*Secretary Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 3rd August.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 3 (Secretary may sit in Parliament).

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, the Amendment he rose to move, although verbal, was one of considerable importance. It had been admitted, in a former discussion on the Bill, that the words "if not a Member of the House of Lords" were merely permissive, though if they meant anything at all they pointed to the new Secretary being a Member of the House of Lords; but if they meant nothing, then he said that they might as well be omitted. He accepted the declaration which the hon. Member for Buteshire (Mr. Dalrymple) made on going into Committee, that it was not intended to allocate this Office either to the House of Lords or to the House of Commons. Therefore, he might assume that the words were not intended to imply that this officer should be a Member of the House of Lords; but, at the same time, the putting in of the words pointed to the probability of his being sometimes a Member of the other House of Parliament, and therefore he thought they were dangerous, and ought to be omitted from the Bill. He admitted that the circumstances in which the former Bill was introduced had given some excuse for the introduction of the words, inasmuch as there was a very eminent Scotchman thoroughly versed in and able to manage Scotch affairs, and more popular in Scotland than any other—he meant the Earl of Rosebery—who had the misfortune to be a Member of the House of Lords; therefore, he said that the circumstances were peculiar. But if the new Secretary were to be a Member of the House of Lords the arrangement would be attended with the utmost inconvenience. Let hon. Members imagine what the state of things would be if the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, instead of being a Member of that House in which he was present every day to answer Questions, were a Member of the House of Lords. Why, Irish Members would not be able to get their Questions answered; and he said that if they were to constitute a Secretary for Scotland, Scotch Members would want to get at him every day and have their Questions answered. It seemed to him only reasonable, then, that the new officer should be a Member of that House, and not of the House of Lords, so that he might always be present to give information upon the various subjects connected with Scotland. Again, all the present Ministers who sat in the House of Lords had Secretaries in the House of Commons; but in this Bill there was no provision for anything of the kind. There was a provision for a certain staff of secretaries and clerks, but there was no provision for any one of them having a seat in that House; and, therefore, if the new officer were to be a Member of the other House of Parliament he would be utterly unrepresented in the House of Commons. Then to say that the Lord Advocate could give answers with regard to a Department not his own would be humiliating to the Lord Advocate, who, in that case, would not express his own opinions, but be merely the mouthpiece of another person, with whom he had no official connection. Having shown the great inconvenience that would arise from the Secretary for Scotland being a Member of the House of Lords, he wanted to make the Bill state clearly one way or the other what was intended; and, therefore, bearing in mind the statement of the hon. Member for Bute (Mr. Dalrymple) that the words "if not a Member of the House of Lords" did not carry the meaning that the new officer was to be a Member of either House in preference to the other, in the interest of statesmanship, grammar, and good drafting, he begged to move that they be struck out of the clause.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 18, to leave out the words "if not a Member of the House of Lords."—(*Sir George Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. J. B. BALFOUR said, his recollection did not entirely agree with that of his hon. Friend who had just spoken. According to his recollection, when the former Bill was before the House two years ago, his hon. Friend made almost the same speech against these words as he had made that night, and he (Mr. J. B. Balfour) had the honour of answering it. He thought it was the feeling of the House at the time that there should not be a restriction in the Bill upon the selection of the Crown of a fit officer who might be found in either House. It would seem that his hon. Friend had rather shifted his ground, because he had now hinted that there should be something like a plain intimation in the Bill that, so to speak, the other House of Legislature should be excluded. He submitted that the Committee should adhere to the decision arrived at two years ago after some hours' discussion.

Mr. BUCHANAN said, he thought the right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Lord Advocate had omitted two points in connection with this subject. It was true that an Amendment of this kind was brought forward two years ago, but it was brought forward by the right hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff), and it was supported by Scotch Members now on those Benches. But it would seem from the silence of right hon. Gentlemen opposite that it was not considered worth while now to discuss an Amendment of this character. This clause was taken almost verbatim from the Local Government Board (England) Act of 1871; but the clause in that Act which corresponded to the clause in this Bill did not contain these words. He asked why were these words introduced into the present Bill, unless there was some intention of a Member of the House of Lords being generally appointed to this Office? If the words meant nothing he could not see what objection there could be to removing them; if they meant anything they could only have the meaning he had applied to them. Therefore, he thought they ought to have a distinct statement from Her Majesty's Government as to what was meant by putting them into the Bill.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he could assure hon. Members that, as far as the present Government were concerned, there was no thought of giving preference to one House or the other; nor did he believe there was any such intention on the part of the late Government, although, of course, he knew nothing whatever about that. Her Majesty's Government only wanted to appoint the most fitting person to the Office. But the words being in the clause he should be extremely sorry if they were struck out, because it would seem as if they meant to give the preference to a Member of the House of Commons.

Amendment *negatived.*

On Motion of Sir R. Assheton Cross, the following Amendments made:—Page 1, line 23, leave out "and;" line 24, at end, add—

"And in Part First of the Schedule of 'The Promissory Oaths Act, 1868,' as regards England."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Seal, style, and acts of Secretary) *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Transfer of powers of—Secretary of State: Privy Council: Local Government Board and Treasury).

Mr. A. R. D. ELLIOT said, he had put on the Paper an Amendment to Sub-section (2), the object of which was to insert after the word "Schedule" the words—

"And generally all powers and duties of the Scotch Education Department as defined by 'The Education (Scotland) Act, 1872,' in relation to education in Scotland."

He might mention that, besides his own Amendment, there was another Amendment standing on the Paper in the name of his hon. Friend the Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce), which went a very long way in the same direction as his own, the object of both being to insure, as far as they could, that the transfer of the powers and duties with regard to education in Scotland from the Education Department to the new Minister for Scotland should be thorough and real. At this point he should like to say, with regard to certain objections which had been made to their contention that the Minister for Scotland should be a real personage, that he was sure that there was no part of Scotland where there was any wish to go in the direction of what was called Home Rule. He moved that these powers should be transferred to the Minister for Scotland, because they wished him to have as many important powers as they could give him; but, coming from Scotland, he could speak with some authority in saying that he did not believe that with any true and thorough Scotchman, from one end of the country to another, there was any wish to go in the direction of Home Rule. He, for one, looked upon that in reference to Ireland, Scotland, and Wales as an idle dream. If there were anything which would make Scotchmen unwilling to approach the question of the repeal of the Union, it would be the idea that Scotland was being made a stalking horse in this matter of Home Rule. But he did not wish to pursue that subject any further. And while they objected to Home Rule for Scotland, they disliked the idea of English Home Rule in England; and they looked forward with increased hope to the future, when Scotland, having one-sixth more than the present number of its Members, would speak with a louder voice than hitherto, not only in the affairs of Scotland, but with regard to the affairs of the Empire. They wished to improve the administrative machinery under which Scotland was governed. They had their Scotch Boards, and other Scotch Departments, and in many respects they were a self-governing community; and they wished that the educational institutions of the country, which were not less national than other institutions, should be in the hands of a Scotch Minister. The Bill had assumed its present shape, if he might say so, almost unawares; it had passed through a certain ordeal of discussion in "another place;" but, so far as the subject of education was concerned, it was a Bill entirely different from that which was introduced in the House of Lords. The shape in which it was introduced in the other House of Parliament was the shape to which he desired to restore it by the words of his Amendment. When the Bill was before the other House in that shape an Amendment was printed and circulated among noble Lords to the effect that it was proposed to omit all mention of the Education Act, and to substitute the words "President of the Council" in the clause, by which the new Minister to be appointed by the Bill would not have all the powers of the Education Act conferred upon him, but would be simply President of the Council by virtue of the Bill. That Amendment, which was put on the Paper and circulated, was never thoroughly discussed in the House of Lords; and when, next day, the Bill was printed it was found that other words had been inserted. It was in that way that the Bill came into its present shape. He had been gratified to hear some remarks made by the right hon. Gentleman the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt) on the previous evening, from which he gathered that they would have his powerful support for the Bill as presented to the other House of Parliament. The Scotch Education Department, whose powers he wished to see transferred to the new Minister, was a Body called into existence by the Scotch Education Act of 1872. That lawfully constituted Body, which ought to be supreme in educational matters in Scotland, was not supreme, because they were, unhappily, in the hands of the Vice President of the Council. If any hon. Member looked into the Statutes he would find that there was a constituted authority for the management of Scotch educational affairs, and he would find in the Scotch Education Act of 1872 no reference whatever to the Vice President of the Council. The Vice President of the Council obtained his authority under the Act of 1856; but, inasmuch as this system was started in 1872, it would appear to be meant by the Statute of that year that the Board of Education should be supreme in educational matters. Well, that Body, constituted as he had shown, practically never met at all. [Mr. MUNDELLA dissented.] The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella) shook his head; but he had been told that it had been characterized by the Earl of Rosebery, who knew the state of affairs in Scotland very well, as a "phantom Board." He had been informed that, even in the important annual work of the Department for the purpose of introducing the annual Code, it had not been the practice to summon the Council together. His right hon. Friend might say that the Government were about to inaugurate a different state of things. But they were now regulating matters by Act of Parliament; and he should like to know, and have it stated on the face of this Act, who was really to be their authority in future over Scotch education matters? If there was one point which more than another had characterized Scotch education, it was the thoroughly local character of that education. In England it was the Privy Council on which the whole system of education depended. It was entirely different with regard to Scotland. They had long had in Scotland a national and local system of education; and he said that those who told them that educational interests in Scotland could not be looked after without the aid of the Education Department of the Privy Council were putting aside all the teachings of history. And when it was attempted to be pointed out, as it was last night by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair), that it was due to that Department that Scotch education had so progressed, he replied that the progress of Scotch education had been mainly due to the old laws of Scotland, under which there was no Central Department whatever. It was those laws, the local energies of the Scotch people, their parochial efforts, and their love of education, which they had to thank for education in Scotland being now so far advanced. As in the past so it would be in the future. He said that the main basis of the educational system of Scotland was to trust to the local bodies and school boards, and not to the Central Government in England or elsewhere. He did not think that in every case the Education Department had done everything it might have done to assist local efforts; and that, he maintained, was its principal duty. He knew it would be impossible to get from the late Vice President of the Council anything like a sympathetic opinion on that point; but they must not be governed in these matters by Departmental considerations. They had to look at the question from the general point of view of the people of Scotland. They had had last night an eloquent speech from the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir. Lyon Playfair) against the Bill; but he would ask if he meant to tell them that Scotch education would have been in a worse position if it had been his business, from a sympathetic point of view, to superintend the administration of education in Scotland? He spoke of no secondary interest, and not merely of the interest of a small country attached to a larger one; but if this had been the main business of some distinguished Scotchman — that to which he looked to make his credit and fame—then he said that Scotland would have been much better off in the matter of education than it was to-day. He would not trespass longer on the time of the Committee, further than to say that he did not wish to differ from the hon. Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce). His own Amendment, however, seemed to be the more thorough-going, and he preferred it for the reason that it made the matter perfectly clear, and therefore he asked the Committee to accept it. Finally, he thought that the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department should explain to the Committee clearly what line Her Majesty's Government meant to take up with regard to this matter, and whether they intended to make the educational transfer as thorough as he and his hon. Friends desired it to be. He believed there was strong feeling amongst Scotch Members in favour of making that transfer real and substantial.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 12, after the word Schedule, to insert the words "and generally all powers and duties of the Scotch Education Department, as defined by 'The Education (Scotland) Act, 1872,' in relation to education in Scotland."—(*Mr. A. R. D. Elliot.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir JOHN LUBBOCK submitted to the Committee that this was not merely a Scotch question; it was also one in which England was very much interested, because if they separated Scotch education from English they equally separated English education from Scottish. This had been represented as a matter of Scottish self-government, and, no doubt, self-government was a matter that was extremely desirable; but it would not be promoted by this Bill. He deprecated the clause as it stood, and was in favour of the adoption of the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair). The Bill did not give the people of Mid Lothian or Perthshire, or Edinburgh or Glasgow, any additional powers over their own educational affairs; but it merely placed the administration under one Minister of the Crown instead of under another. It did not transfer the administration even to Edinburgh, but left it, as it was now, in London. The object at which they should aim was to secure, as far as possible, the same laws for the Three Kingdoms, and, remembering that union was strength, to maintain firmly the unity of the Empire. But the tendency of the clause was very different. It did not give any additional powers of local self-government; but, on the other hand, it tended to introduce differences between Scotland and England. The tendency even of the same system administered by different persons was to introduce different treatment, and no one who had had the honour of sitting on the Public Accounts Committee of that House could fail to have observed how the same Acts were interpreted in a totally different manner by different Departments. The House of Commons had for many years been gradually assimilating the laws of England and Scotland, to the great advantage of both Kingdoms, and this unfortunate and mischievous Bill was a step backwards. They had all condemned the incongruous arrangement which placed under one Minister the responsibility for education and for cattle disease. But it was now proposed, so far as Scotland was concerned, to aggravate this anomaly tenfold, and impose on one Minister a number of incongruous duties, to perform the majority of which he must necessarily be unsuited. The question before the Committee was, in truth, whether Ministers should be allocated to subjects or to localities. If the clause under discussion passed they could not stop there. The real question appeared to him to be whether they should have in future one Minister for Education, another for the Local Government Board, another presiding over the Home Office, and so on; or whether they should have separate Ministers for different localities—Ministers for Scotland, for England, for Wales, and so on; because if they once took a step in that direction they could not refrain from going further. Surely it would be wiser to have their Ministers according to the subject with which they had to deal rather than according to the localities. Which was the most natural division of duties, by subjects or by localities? His hon. Friend who had just sat down stated that no one who had been present last night could have failed to mark the want of credit which was given to the Report of the Committee which sat last year. He respectfully differed altogether from the views of the hon. Member. No doubt, the Committee had reported in opposition to the views of the hon. Member and those who agreed with him; but he thought that Members generally would concur with him (Sir John Lubbock) that the Committee was considered at the time a very strong Committee. An assertion had been made that the Committee declined to hear Scotch witnesses; but he believed that was entirely a mistake. None of the Members of the Committee to whom he had been able to speak remembered any circumstance of the kind. The Committee had examined the Heads of the Department, both of whom were Scotchmen. As to the opinion of Scotland on this question, his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair) showed them last night that the opinion of the educationalists of Scotland was mainly against the proposals in the Bill. His hon. Friend who had just sat down had referred to the views of the Paisley Town Council and others who were in favour of the clause; but although the Town Council of Paisley had petitioned in favour of it, the school board of that town had petitioned in an opposite sense. In fact, the most important school boards were opposed to the clause in the Bill. So far as he could learn, there had only been one meeting upon the subject held in Scotland, and that was of the Educational Congress at Ayr, where a resolution was submitted upon the question, and the decision arrived at was unanimously in favour of the appointment of a Minister of Education for the whole Kingdom. One member of the Congress, who moved an amendment in the sense of the clause, got no support whatever, and did not press it to a division. This was not only a Scotch question, but he maintained that English opinion should also be taken into consideration. Now, in England he believed there was no one who was interested in education who would not lament a separation, so far as education was concerned, between England and Scotland. They now selected for the Vice Presidency of the Council some statesman whose attention had been particularly directed to the important question of education, and who could give to it, he would not say his sole attention, but, at any rate, the best of his energies. Having decided the questions which came before him, the whole of Great Britain had the benefit of his experience. But what would happen under the clause? The Minister for Scotland would not be chosen specially from an educational point of view. In the first place, he must generally be a Scotchman. He would have to deal with a great variety of subjects which must more or less be taken into account. But even suppose that they got a man as good, from an educational point of view, as they did now, still he would not practically be so efficient. His time and thoughts, instead of being in the main concentrated on education, would be distracted by problems connected with the other duties which the Bill proposed to throw upon him. He doubted whether among English schoolmasters one could be found in favour of the proposed change. The National Union of Elementary Teachers, at their annual Conference, passed a resolution to the effect that a Minister of Education should be immediately appointed, who should have charge of elementary and secondary education in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; and subsequently the executive of the Association resolved that every assistance be given to the educational institutions of Scotland in their opposition to the Secretary for Scotland Bill. There was very general opposition in England to any proposal to separate England from Scotland in the work of education, and there was a nearly unanimous opinion that education would be greatly benefited by maintaining the connection. National education must be considered from a national point of view, and not merely from the point of view of any one locality, however important; because the result of separation would not be decentralization, but disintegration. If they substituted local authority in this case they would find themselves unable to stop there. They had already seen what the tendency was, because when the Bill was first drafted, two or three years ago, it did not include education. Education was now included in it, and there was still every danger of allocating fresh subjects to the Minister for Scotland. In fact, the whole tendency was to separate the administration of the two countries from each other. Of course, if that were done in regard to Scotland, it was clear that it would render it still more difficult to resist the desire for Home Rule on the part of Ireland. The hon. Member stated that he had no desire to establish anything in the shape of Home Rule; but it did not matter what the desire of his hon. Friend was if the adoption of a principle of this kind tended directly to encourage such a measure. It would certainly be still more difficult to resist Home Rule in Ireland; and then there would probably be a similar demand on the part of Wales. Indeed, it was impossible to say where it would stop. No doubt hon. Gentlemen who supported the clause did not concur with him in that opinion. He hoped that they might be right, and that he might be wrong. Again, there was a very strong, he might almost say a unanimous, desire on the part of those interested in education that there should be a Minister of Education, and that he should have a seat in the Cabinet. Evidently, however, the Bill would tend to defeat that object. Scotch Members seemed to regard this as a small matter; but in Scotland itself the Bill was regarded as of much importance. It was stated by some hon. Gentlemen that it was simply a matter of administration; but it seemed to him to have a much wider bearing; and he confessed that he could not help looking upon the proposal with a considerable amount of apprehension. For his part he opposed the clause, because he feared it might prove "the little reft in the lute" which would introduce discord, and destroy the harmony between different portions of the Empire which they ought, by every means in their power, to promote. He, therefore, expressed a sincere hope that Her Majesty's Government would not adopt the Amendment which had been proposed, but would, on the contrary, support that of the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh.

DR. CAMERON wished to make an explanation with regard to the statement of his hon. Friend the Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock), that some Members of the Childers' Committee were not aware that Scotch evidence had been tendered to the Committee and refused. As he (Dr. Cameron) was responsible for that statement he would give his authority. The Secretary to the Scotch Board of Education (Dr. Taylor) wrote as follows:—

> "I wrote to Sir Lyon Playfair earnestly recommending that the Chairman, and, at least, one member of the late Board of Education, should be invited to give evidence, and he paid no attention to my suggestion."

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR: I never heard of that suggestion until this moment.

MR. ASHER remarked, that if his hon. Friend the Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock) had been in the House last night he would have discovered that the almost unanimous opinion of the House was contrary to the views he had expressed.

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK said, there had been a mistake about the second reading of the Bill. He, and others, had been given to understand that it would not be taken, or they would have been in their places.

MR. ASHER said, he rather thought that the proceedings of last night had conclusively established that, by the general assent of the House, Scotch education was to be transferred from the Vice President of the Council to the Secretary for Scotland; and, as far as he could gather, the speech of his hon. Friend was directed against the principle of the Bill, and against the establishment of any Minister at all for the administration of Scotch affairs. He did not rise for the purpose of replying to the speech of his hon. Friend the Member for the University of London (Sir John Lubbock), but for the purpose of making some remarks on the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. Elliot), because he fully realized the great importance of that Amendment. It seemed to him that it very fairly raised the question as to what ought to be the official status and the position of the Secretary for Scotland in regard to the administration of Scotch education. Upon the decision of that question it would very largely depend whether the transfer of Scotch education from the Vice President of the Council to the Secretary for Scotland was to be a step advantageous or the reverse. The propriety of that transfer, he thought, had been generally regarded as involving questions of great delicacy and difficulty; and he did not attempt to conceal that he had regarded it from that point of view. But after the best consideration he had been able to give to the subject he had come to the conclusion that the advantages resulting from the transfer would outweigh the possible disadvantages which were anticipated by some. But, at the same time, he thought the realization of the advantages depended very largely on what might be the official status and position of the Secretary for Scotland in regard to the administration of Scotch education. He was, therefore, anxious to make some remarks on the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. Elliot), because he was in this position —that he sympathized very largely with the views expressed by his hon. Friend; but, at the same time, he was unable to agree with the Amendment he had proposed. He understood that it was the desire of his hon. Friend in moving the Amendment to aggrandize, as far as he could, the position of the Secretary who would be charged with the administration of Scotch education, and in that desire his hon. Friend had his entire sympathy; but he asked his hon. Friend's attention to the fact that if the Amendment he had proposed were carried the result would be to extinguish the Scotch Education Department; and while he wished to see the Secretary for Scotland occupying as prominent and leading a position as possible in connection with that Department, he doubted very much the expediency of extinguishing the Department, and vesting the whole powers at present belonging to it exclusively in the Secretary for Scotland. He asked his hon. Friend to consider whether he was not going a little beyond the point he himself aimed at in pressing the Amendment; and whether the result he desired to secure would not be more effectually obtained if he were to withdraw the Amendment and support the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Fifeshire (Mr. Preston Bruce), who proposed to substitute for "Vice President" the word "President." On the question what was to be the position of the Secretary for Scotland in reference to Scotch education, there appeared to be three propositions before the Committee. There was the proposal in the Bill to make the Secretary a Vice President; there was the proposal of his right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair) that the Secretary should be an *ex officio* Member of the Department. There was also the proposal of the hon. Member for Fifeshire (Mr. Preston Bruce) to make the Secretary for Scotland President of the Education Department. He had no hesitation in saying that he was in favour of the view suggested by his hon. Friend the Member for Fifeshire (Mr. Preston Bruce). It appeared to him that there could be no greater danger to Scotch education than to place it under the charge of a Minister who would not be a Scotch Education Minister in fact, but merely in name. He doubted very much, if the Scotch Secretary were merely Vice President of the Council, or merely a Member *ex officio* of the Council, whether he would be anything more than a Scotch Minister of Education in name. The effect of the Bill in that case would be to detach Scotch education from the care of the present Vice President of the Council, and, therefore, to lose the benefit of his attention and administration, and to hand it over to a Minister who, in his (Mr. Asher's) opinion, would not have the power that was essential to enable him properly to discharge his duties to Scotland in the matter. There could be no doubt of the importance of everything connected with education to the people of Scotland. There was, probably, no subject in which the whole mass of the people of Scotland were more directly interested than in that of education. To the facilities of education they had hitherto enjoyed they owed more than anything else the position they had occupied in the battle of life. After this Bill passed the Scotch people would look to the Secretary for Scotland and hold him responsible for the proper administration of education. It appeared to him that that was a responsibility which it would not be legitimate or fair to put upon any Minister, unless they gave to him, at the same time, power to deal with it according to his own judgment. If he were merely to be a Vice President of the Council, or an *ex offioio* Member of the Council, he would not have the opportunity of exercising that power and that independent judgment which was essential to the proper administration of his Office. He would be liable to be frustrated by a possible difference of opinion between the Lord President of the Council and himself, on the one hand, and on the other, through want of sufficient authority in himself, to be controlled, to a large extent, by the permanent Department over which he would preside. He (Mr. Asher) did not mean by that to depreciate the great advantage it must be for a Minister to have the assistance of a permanent Department; but there could not be any doubt that, as between the Minister and the permanent Department, the influence of the Minister would largely depend upon whether he was independent or subordinate. He thought that it would be highly disadvantageous to the interests of Scotch education if the Secretary for Scotland, whom he assumed it was now decided to charge with the administration of Scotch education, were not a person with controlling power in the matter; and he humbly thought that the best way of effecting that object was to accept the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Fifeshire (Mr. Preston Bruce), and not that of the hon. Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. Elliot), which took no step to strengthen the hands of the Minister, but to deprive him of the able advice he would obtain from a Scotch Education Department. He wished to see the Minister in the position of a person rather having to take than to give advice. If he were a Vice President he would give advice; if he were President he would receive advice, and act according to his own judgment.

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR said, he would remind the Committee that it would be impossible ever to get through their work if endless speeches ranging over all the Amendments on the Paper were to be delivered. He would, therefore, confine himself to the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. Elliot). His hon. Friend seemed to have forgotten the speech of the Earl of Rosebery in the other House when he introduced his Bill. The noble Earl said he was desirous to transfer education wholly to the Scotch Minister; but upon examining it he found he would have to pull up all the education of Scotland, root and branch, from the present system, and he said it was impossible to do that on the lines of the Department as it now existed. It was for that reason that the noble Earl altered the Bill, and made the Scotch Secretary Vice President of the Education Department. He did not propose to discuss that question now, because it would come on afterwards; but he entreated the Committee not to agree to the Amendment of his hon. Friend, which was really pulling up the whole root of the education of Scotland without repealing the Acts upon which it had been grounded, or introducing any other measure by which education could be carried on. The Bill at present ran on the lines of the Education Department; but the Amendment proposed by his hon. Friend was a complete upheaval of the whole system, without substituting anything else that was reasonable. He therefore opposed the Amendment of his hon. Friend.

MR. RAMSAY said, he did not understand the Amendment of his hon. Friend in the way in which the right hon. Gentleman understood it. The Amendment proposed to confer on the new Minister all the powers and duties of the Scotch Education Department as defined by "The Education (Scotland) Act, 1872." He saw no reason why the conferring of those powers on the Secretary for Scotland should do away with the Scotch Education Department. There was no reason for apprehending any such consequence, and there was no provision of the kind contained in the Amendment. The Amendment simply proposed to continue in the Secretary for Scotland all the power and privileges of the Scotch Education Department, and the power and privileges of the Scotch Education Department were defined in the Act of 1872, and other Acts relating to education, which would hereafter have to be dealt with. He thought it would be a great mistake, and he quite concurred with his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Elgin (Mr. Asher) in thinking that there would be advantage in having the Secretary for Scotland Minister of the Scotch Education Department rather than that a second President of the Council should be established. But he thought his hon. and learned Friend was forgetting that the Education Department up to this time, as far as counsel and advice had gone, had never been anything more than a name. What had they done? [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members laughed, he presumed, at the idea of his putting such a query, seeing that the Scotch Education Department never met. He had certainly never heard of a meeting of the Scotch Education Department—that was to say, that the Members of the Department, who were Privy Councillors, had never been called together on any occasion except in regard to the Bill now under discussion, and called the "Heriot's Endowment Bill."

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) thought that the Committee were wasting time in this preliminary discussion. The point the Committee had to decide and what the Government wanted to know was whether the Scotch people wanted to hand over Scotch educational affairs to a President, a Vice President, or an *ex officio* Member of the Privy Council. Those were the three propositions which were before the Committee. He did not wish to discuss any of the three alternatives; but he would ask his hon. Friend the Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. Elliot) whether he did not think it a more convenient course to withdraw his Amendment, and discuss the subject on the Amendment of the hon. Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce)? He thought that would be far the most convenient course for the Committee to take, and he would recommend it in the interest of progress.

Mr. A. R. D. ELLIOT said, he could not withdraw the Amendment at present. He should like, in the first place, to know more distinctly what the Government proposed to do in the matter, and whether his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Elgin (Mr. Asher) represented the views of the Front Opposition Bench? He would remind the Committee that in moving the Amendment he had begun his statement by pointing out that there was no antagonism between his Amendment and that of his hon. Friend the Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce). He thought, however, that the whole question would be better considered in one discussion rather than in two or three, and he would like that one discussion to be taken now.

Mr. ASHER, in reply to a question from the hon. Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. Elliot), said, that in the remarks he had made he had only expressed his own personal opinions.

Mr. PRESTON BRUCE said, the present difficulty of the position was a good deal owing to extreme uncertainty as to what the Government intended to do. As far as he could determine, the Bill of the Government placed the Secretary for Scotland in exactly the same relation to the Lord President as the Vice President now occupied, and, consequently, it left the question of the patronage of the Scotch Education Department in the hands of the Lord President; secondly, it probably left the Scotch official staff along with the English official staff; and, in the third place, he supposed it implied that in the meetings of the Scotch Committee of the Privy Council the Lord President would preside if he were present. It was something to know that that was the meaning of the clause as it stood; but it was an arrangement which, he thought, was much to be deprecated; and, personally, he would rather take the direct Amendment proposed by the hon. Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. Elliot), yet he believed that his (Mr. Bruce's) Amendment would substantially have the same effect. If he had any indication from the Government that they would accept it, he believed the hon. Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. Elliot) would withdraw his Amendment.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. Balfour) said, that the Government thought that, on the whole, the Bill as it now stood represented the general bias of Scotch sentiment. He admitted that they had had some difficulty in arriving at that opinion. They did not think that the various Amendments were very profound or very substantial; and, on the whole, they were of opinion that the scheme embodied in the Bill was the best scheme that could be adopted, and they desired to take the opinion of the Committee on that question. The hon. Gentleman who had just sat down had asked a series of questions as to the precise position which, under the Bill, the Minister for Scotland would occupy. The Government thought the Minister for Scotland should occupy, as regarded Scotch education, precisely the same position as that which was occupied in regard to English education by the Vice President of the Council—not a higher and not a lower position. The Amendment of the hon. Gentleman would, as he understood the matter, put him in a higher position than was occupied by his right hon. Friend near him (Mr. E. Stanhope) in regard to England. He did not think that that would effect any improvement in the matter. To give to Scotland everything that England had appeared to the Government to be adequate and sufficient. Therefore, the Bill as it stood was a sufficient and reasonable compromise between the extreme views expressed by the hon. Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce) on the one hand, and those of the right hon. Member for Edinburgh University (Sir Lyon Playfair) on the other. The Government were satisfied, on the whole, that the opinion of Scotland was in favour of the Bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN said, that at last they had arrived at the deliverance of the Government Bench; but it certainly was not in accordance with the opinion expressed by the right hon. Gentleman last night. As far as he understood the right hon. Gentleman's statement last night, it was that his opinion was that the Scotch Secretary should be made—he thought the word used by the right hon. Gentleman was "Chairman" of the Education Board.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. Balfour) said, that he had never said anything of the kind. What he had said was that the effect of the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman opposite would be to make the Secretary for Scotland Chairman; but he had never said that he thought he should be so.

Mr. BUCHANAN begged the right hon. Gentleman's pardon; but many hon. Members had been under a similar misapprehension, and had regarded the statement of the right hon. Gentleman in that way. But in regard to what the right hon. Gentleman had now said, there could be no question that the Government did not intend to give the Scotch Secretary effective charge of education. There could no longer be any doubt about that. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair) had pointed it out with perfect clearness last night; and there was one part of the right hon. Gentleman's speech in which he (Mr. Buchanan) entirely concurred — namely, where he pointed out that the Scotch Secretary, as Vice President in regard to Scotch education, instead of being practically paramount, as in England, would virtually have no control over education. The nod which the Home Secretary gave just now to the hon. Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce) fully confirmed his (Mr. Buchanan's) interpretation as to the result of what the Government proposed to do. His hon. Friend had asked if this Bill would leave all the patronage in the hands of the Lord President, and the right hon. Gentleman nodded "Yes." And when his hon. Friend further asked if it would not also leave the staff for the Scotch educational work in the English Department, the President of the Local Government Board approved. Now, that was contrary to what the Home Secretary had told them last night in regard to Clause 2. [*Cries of* "No!"] The right hon. Gentleman was asked whether the Amendment proposed by him to be introduced into Clause 2 would enable the officials of the Department charged with Scotch education to be transferred to the new Secretary's Office, and he answered yes; but they now discovered that, although it would enable them to be transferred to the new Office, it was not the intention of the Government that they should be so transferred. [*Cries of* "No!"] Well, the right hon. Gentleman did not deny it; and now they had a declaration from the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board, speaking on behalf of the Government, that it was not the intention to work the Scotch Education Department from the Secretary for Scotland's Office. He, therefore, maintained that the Government did not intend to give the Scotch Secretary effective charge of Scotch education under this Bill. His right hon. Friend the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair) had quoted the Earl of Rosebery, but had omitted to say what the nature of the discussion was which took place in the House of Lords. The Bill, as it now stood, was not in the shape in which the Amendment had been submitted by the Earl of Rosebery; and what the Earl of Rosebery said in regard to the purport of the Bill as it stood was that it was not taking Scotch education out of the Education Office, nor was it putting education under the control of the Scotch Board.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. Balfour): Who said that?

Mr. BUCHANAN said, he was quoting a speech of the Earl of Rosebery in the House of Lords on the third reading of the Bill. The Marquess of Lothian, on the same occasion, asked if it was intended that the Scotch Education Department was to be wholly distinct and separate from the English Education Department, and the control vested in a Scotch Minister upon the Committee of Council. [*Cries of* "Order!"] He fully appreciated the generosity of the Committee in allowing him to transgress the Rules of the Committee by quoting a debate in "another place." But they had the evidence of the Earl of Rosebery himself in the House of Lords and the statement of a supporter of the Government in the House of Lords that the Bill would not give, in any effective way, the charge of Scotch education to the Secretary for Scotland. And now the Government told them that it had never been intended, in any effective way, to confer the charge of Scotch education upon the Secretary for Scotland. Therefore, in order to test the sincerity of the Government on the subject, he hoped they would have a distinct division — he did not care whether it was taken upon the present Amendment or that of the hon. Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce)—as to whether they were to give effective control—yes or no—of Scotch education to the Secretary for Scotland.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, the hon. Member was mistaken in regard to what had fallen from his right hon. Friend the President of the Local Government Board either last night or to-night. He was not aware that his right hon. Friend had ever changed his mind at all; and the Government were responsible for this part of the Bill long before it came down from the House of Lords. He thought the hon. Member was wrong in saying that the Government did not wish that the Scotch people should have a proper voice in their own educational matters. If the general feeling of all the Scotch Members had been clearly one on this matter, the Government, whatever their own views were, would have felt bound by their opinions; but, unfortunately, the opinion of the Scotch Members was very much divided. There were, as the President of the Local Government Board had stated, three different and distinct views on the subject. One was that the whole of the work in connection with the Scotch Education Department should absolutely and completely pass over to the Scotch Office under the charge of a President, and, although nominally in London, it should be absolutely separate from the Education Department. That was one view of the matter. Another view was that the Secretary for Scotland should simply be an *ex officio* Member of the Scotch Education Board, which went entirely the other way. A great number of people in Scotland took one view of the matter; but there was also a considerable number of persons who would be quite content with a mean between the two extremes, and that mean had been found in the present Bill. As there was nothing like unanimity in Scotland as to either of the extremes, he thought it would be wise to remain by the Bill as it stood. The hon. Member who last spoke might not have known that there was an Amendment on the Paper in the name of his hon. Friend the Member for the University of Glasgow (Mr. J. A. Campbell), to the effect that the Scotch Education Board should have a distinct permanent Secretary to attend to the business of Scotch education. To that Amendment he attached considerable importance. They considered that if the Secretary for Scotland was to be Vice President of the Education Board for Scotland, it was quite right that he should have a permanent Secretary with an adequate staff. So far as the Government were concerned, they had a real desire to know what the voice of the people of Scotland was in the matter; but, under all the circumstances, he thought it would be better to abide by the Bill as it stood in the absence of any strong feeling in favour of one or other of the three alternatives proposed, and he hoped they would now go to a division, so that they might see how Scotch opinion was running on the point. That could scarcely be done by first having one speech on one side and then one on the other.

MR. WILLIAMSON said, he hoped the Committee had now really done with the Amendment. He confessed that he was unable to read the Amendment of the hon. Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) without looking at the other Amendment in the name of the same hon. Member in which they were asked to leave out Clause 6, which would be perfectly destructive of education in Scotland. The Committee were placed in a sort of quandary between making the Secretary for Scotland either President, or Vice President, or an *ex officio* Member. He sympathized with the idea of making the new Minister an *ex officio* Member of the Department only; but he thought the Government had acted wisely in choosing the middle course of making him Vice President.

MR. A. R. D. ELLIOT said, he rose to say that, in consequence of the remarks of the hon. and learned Member for Elgin (Mr. Asher), he would withdraw his Amendment, so that the division might be taken upon that of his hon. Friend the Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce).

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

THE CHAIRMAN asked if the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) withdrew his Amendment?

MR. BUCHANAN said, he did not propose to take that course at present; and as he wished to say a few words upon the Amendment, he would move to insert, after the word "Schedule," in line 12—

> "And all rights of patronage relating to educational offices and appointments in Scotland vested in the Lord President of the Council or the Scotch Education Department."

If the right hon. Gentleman would look at the Amendment, he would see that if the Amendment of his hon. Friend below him (Mr. Elliot), or of his hon. Friend the Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce), had been accepted by the Government, he would never have thought of moving his own; but, on the understanding that the Government were disinclined to accept either of the Amendments of his hon. Friends, he maintained that his would, to a certain degree, extend the functions of the Vice President created by the Bill, and would give him a more effective charge over Scotch education than he would otherwise have. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), in his evidence before the Childers' Committee, had expressed a strong opinion on the subject in support of the idea that the Vice President or Minister in charge of education should also have the charge of the patronage connected with education. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella) had been equally strong upon the subject—that for the effective management of education the Minister in charge should also have the choice of those who were to work out the details of the Department. The right hon. Gentleman had carried his views in that direction, to some extent, during his tenure of Office as Vice President of the Council, and had succeeded in vesting a considerable part of the patronage in the Vice President which had previously been exercised by the Lord President. He (Mr. Buchanan), therefore, thought there was distinct value to be attached to his Amendment, supposing that the Government were unwilling to accept the other two Amendments. As had been pointed out by his right hon. Friend the Member for Edinburgh University (Sir Lyon Playfair), the Vice President, under the Bill, would not really have charge of Scotch education, and would not have any control over the appointments of those who were to carry out the work of the Education Department. His Amendment remedied one of those defects by transferring the patronage of the Department to the new Minister. He also thought that in support of that Amendment he might quote the opinion of the President of the Council himself, because when the Bill was before the House of Lords, and the Lord President was asked a question as to patronage, he stated that it would remain in the hands of the Lord President, in whom it had been vested by statute, and that it could not be removed except by statute. Therefore, he maintained that his Amendment would simply carry out the view of the President of the Council himself, who had stated that he accepted the Amendment of the Earl of Rosebery in substance, and that he wished to vest the patronage connected with the Scotch Education Department in the Secretary for Scotland.

Amendment proposed,

> In page 2, line 12, after the word "Schedule," add "and all rights of patronage relating to educational offices and appointments in Scotland vested in the Lord President of the Council or the Scotch Education Department."—(*Mr. Buchanan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) said, he admitted that it would be a very important thing if the Lord President were to exercise the rights of patronage without consulting the Vice President; but was there the least shadow of ground for supposing that he would do so?

MR. BUCHANAN said, that it had been so.

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) said, the hon. Gentleman forgot that Scotch education was at present managed by the Vice President of the Council. No doubt, there was over that Council a President, and he was nominally vested with the patronage.

MR. BUCHANAN: Not only nominally, but really.

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) said, the same thing applied in the case of England; and could anybody suppose that education in England was vitiated by such an arrangement? Of course, in all educational matters the Lord President consulted the Vice President; and as he consulted the Vice President in England, he would undoubtedly consult the Vice President in Scotland, if the Secretary for Scotland were constituted Vice President by the Bill. He did not think that any difficulty could arise, and no danger would exist in regard to Scotch education which had not existed in reference to English education ever since the Education Act passed. He would go further, and appeal to hon. Gentlemen opposite, who looked forward to the time when there would be one Education Minister for the United Kingdom. He would not presume to say how far an Education Minister for the whole of the Kingdom was necessary; but it was perfectly clear that by establishing two Vice Presidents, one for Scotland and one for England, and having over them a President, they left the door open for any future politicians who might so desire to establish a general Education Minister for the whole Kingdom without seriously disarranging the mechanism which this Bill proposed to constitute. Therefore, neither on the ground of existing practical inconvenience nor on the ground of future inconvenience could any difficulty arise; consequently, he was unable to accept the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman. At all events, it was clear that no weight or burden would be imposed upon Scotch education by this Bill, which did not exist at the present moment in connection with English education; and, as hon. Members well knew, the work of English education was very ably and effectively managed by the Vice President of the Council.

MR. J. B. BALFOUR thought it would be unfortunate if his hon. Friend the Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) were to press this Amendment, and for this reason—that a good many hon. Members would be constrained to vote against it who still wished to give the Minister for Scotland a real and effective control over Scotch education. If they divided upon this Amendment they would be voting upon a false issue. He thought the division ought to be taken upon the Amendment of the hon. Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce) He took it that if this official were made the President of the Education Board, as he hoped to see him, this patronage would follow from his status and position. But if his hon. Friend insisted upon going to a division upon his Amendment hon. Members who wished to see the same object brought about—but who desired to see it brought about in a different way—would be compelled to vote against him, and their vote would be liable to misapprehension. The proper time for considering the question was when they came to deal with the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce), and a declaration about patronage in the present clause would be superfluous and inconvenient. He, therefore, hoped that his hon. Friend would follow the course which had been taken by the hon. Member for Roxburghshire (Mr. Elliot), and would withdraw the Amendment, leaving the Committee to divide upon that of the hon. Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce).

MR. MARJORIBANKS also hoped the hon. Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) would not press his Amendment, which he thought would come a great deal better after they had decided whether the Minister was to be President or Vice President. When they came to discuss the question of patronage, that was a matter upon which he might have a good deal to say; and if there were any danger of the patronage not being exercised by the Secretary of State, then the Amendment of his hon. Friend might be usefully brought up on the Report.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL thought the advice of the late Lord Advocate (Mr. J. B. Balfour) was very good advice, and he hoped his hon. Friend the Member for Edinburgh (Mr. Buchanan) would take that view of the matter. Personally, he was inclined to enter into a compromise which would make the Secretary for Scotland Vice President and retain the connection with England. He thought that would be the best arrangement, and with that view he thought the Amendment had better be brought forward on Clause 6. One great defect in the present English system was that whereas one man did the work another man had the patronage. He thought the Vice President of the Council ought to be the real Minister of Education, and that he should have all the patronage. It would be a very bad thing for education in Scotland, if one Minister were to do all the work of the Department, and another were to exercise all the patronage. He trusted his hon. Friend would persevere with his Amendment, but not upon the present clause. He thought there ought to be in Scotland one man with definite ideas in regard to the administration of education, who should also make all the appointments.

MR. BUCHANAN said, that although he was inclined to agree with his hon. Friend the Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) as to the propriety of withdrawing the Amendment, he was afraid he could not do it on the ground which his hon. Friend had assigned. He wished to point out to the late Lord Advocate—his right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Clackmannan (Mr. J. B. Balfour)—that he appeared to be a little timorous with regard to the votes that were given in that House. He would only point out that if the Committee were to carry his Amendment, the Vice President, who, as far as they knew, was going to be appointed under the Bill, would find his hands considerably strengthened, and strengthened in a direction in which they all desired to see them strengthened. And if his Amendment were carried, the Committee would still be able to vote for the Amendment of his hon. Friend the Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce), which he admitted to be a still more valuable Amendment. But in view of the arguments which had been used by the hon. Member for Berwickshire (Mr. Marjoribanks), rather than put the Committee to the trouble of a division, he was perfectly willing to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL moved the following sub-section to Clause 5:—

> "(4.) All rights of patronage relating to offices and appointments in Scotland vested in one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State."

The previous Amendments down to Clause 6 were not of the first importance; but this Amendment was a very important one, and could not be treated in the same way, seeing that it was the outcome of the wisdom of "another place"—that was to say, of the House of Lords—when the Bill was brought into that House last year. On that occasion it had been threshed out more thoroughly than the Bill of the present year. It was not treated as a Party question, but as a question in regard to which different Parties could put their heads together and make the best Bill they could for the country. He was not one of those who desired to depreciate the House of Lords. On the contrary, he admitted that there was a considerable amount of wisdom in that Assembly, and the outcome of their wisdom on this subject last year was the clause he had copied from the Bill of last Session—a clause which, somehow or other, had dropped out of the Bill of the present year. One of the disadvantages which Scotch Members had to contend with was that Scotch Business was generally hurried over. One great complaint made by the Earl of Rosebery in the other House was that he found it impossible to get this Scotch Bill sufficiently discussed. The Members of the House of Lords were too frequently exhausted by their arduous labours up to half-past 8, when the dinner hour arrived. As that was generally the time a Scotch Bill was reached it was necessarily discussed in a very small House. So far as he could gather from the newspaper reports there had been no proper discussion of this clause at all in the House of Lords; but that was no reason why it should be dropped from the Bill. If the Government would not consent to replace it, seeing that it was in the Bill of last year, he hoped they would tell the Committee the reason why. It was a very important provision, and would vest in the new Minister the rights of patronage at present vested in one of Her Majesty's Secretaries of State. He had had a good deal of official experience, and he would impress upon the Committee that the man who had the patronage had the power, and that if they did not give the Scotch Minister the patronage they would emasculate him. He wanted to know why the Secretary for Scotland should not have the patronage always attached to the Minister who performed the duties of a Secretary of State? He thought it was only reasonable to give the Scotch Minister sufficient power and dignity to induce the people to respect the Office. He would not go further into the matter at the present moment, but he would await an explanation of the views of the Government. He begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, after line 19, to insert the following sub-section :—" (4.) All rights of patronage relating to offices and appointments in Scotland vested in one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State."—(*Sir George Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he did not understand the observation of the hon. Member that a number of the Amendments which originally appeared on the Paper had been "pooh-poohed." No Amendment had been "pooh-poohed" by the Government. All they desired was to ascertain the opinion of the Scotch Representatives on the matter, and he hoped there would be no further waste of time over collateral matters. In regard to the present Amendment, one reason why he objected to it was that he did not find it in the Bill. The hon. Member had stated that the House was sometimes very wise, and that they had shown their wisdom last year by sending down the Bill with this provision in it. But if first thoughts were the wisest, second thoughts were the best; and when the present Bill came down from the House of Lords, in their maturer wisdom of the present year, they had not included the subject of the Amendment in the Bill. But a much better reason for objecting to the Amendment was that the Secretary for Scotland would have a great deal to do, no doubt, with the question of Scotch education, but this patronage principally related to the administration of the law. The last clause of the Bill provided that—

> "Nothing in this Act contained shall prejudice or interfere with any rights, powers, privileges, or duties vested in or imposed on the Lord Advocate by virtue of any Act of Parliament or custom."

The Lord Advocate was one of the great Officers of State for Scotland, and he ought to remain so, and it was not intended by the creation of the Secretary for Scotland in any way to interfere with the legitimate functions of the Lord Advocate. The Lord Advocate was the head of the law in Scotland, and was practically the adviser of the Secretary of State, and no appointment was ever made by the Secretary of State which was not recommended by the Lord Advocate. He stood, practically, as far as Scotch legal patronage was concerned, precisely on the same footing as the Lord Chancellor in England. The appointments were nominally made by the Secretary of State, but really by the Lord Advocate, who knew the persons best fitted for them, whereas the Secretary of State really could know nothing about them without consulting the Lord Advocate. He considered that he had given a sufficient reason why this patronage should remain vested in the Lord Advocate and should not be transferred to the Secretary for Scotland.

MR. PRESTON BRUCE said, he could not recommend his hon. Friend to go to a division on this Amendment, not because he did not think it an important one, but because he thought it so very important that it was impossible to expect that it would be accepted at this stage. He could not help feeling, however, that the Scotch Secretary, as appointed under the Bill, might, after all, turn out to be not so effective a Minister as the people of Scotland generally expected. If that was the case, it would be on account of the absence of a clause of this kind, and the very distinct saving there was of all the rights of the Lord Advocate, because the effect of that was to leave the Lord Advocate in relation with the Home Secretary and not with the Secretary for Scotland. So long as that was the case, he was afraid that in questions of great importance the Scotch Secretary would not be able to stand against the combined influence of the Lord Advocate and the Home Secretary. However, he thought this was much too large a question to be raised at this stage; and he thought, if the Bill was to go through at all, it must be accepted, substantially, in the form in which it had been presented.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he was inclined to think that the advice of his hon. Friend tendered in so friendly a spirit was judicious advice. He confessed that he entertained the fears of his hon. Friend, and was afraid that the privileges of the new Secretary of State might be too much lopped off, and that it might turn out that he was merely an odd man to do a few odd jobs. He would not stand further in the way, but would withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

MR. C. S. PARKER said, that before parting with the clause he wished to put a question to the Government. The policy of the clause was to vest in the new Secretary for Scotland the powers set forth in the First Schedule. Had it been considered if there were any powers and duties of an administrative kind belonging to Sheriffs that ought to be transferred under the Bill, particularly with reference to the supervision of bye-laws submitted under the Roads and Bridges Act and the Locomotives Regulation Act? If they would refer to the Locomotives Act, they would find that the bye-laws were made by the Local Authority, and had to be confirmed by the Secretary of State; but if they would look to the Roads and Bridges Act, they would find that the bye-laws were confirmed by the Sheriff of the county. He saw no good reason, when they were appointing a new Officer, why they should not give him the general supervision of the bye-laws made by the Road Authorities as well as of those affecting locomotives. There was one point which had attracted a good deal of public attention lately—namely, the bye-laws for the regulation of bicycles and tricycles. It was inconvenient to have local bye-laws differing in different counties. In some counties, the Sheriff had revised the bye-laws in a way to give satisfaction to the persons concerned. In other cases, bye-laws had been issued which had created a good deal of dissatisfaction. In England there was but one Revising Authority—the Local Government Board. Why should not the Scotch Secretary have similar authority for all Scotland? He had no wish to press the matter unduly, but he would like to have some assurance that the matter would be considered.

MR. MARJORIBANKS said, he would like to ask a question in regard to a similar point in connection with the Board of Trade. The Board of Trade had certain powers in regard to foreshores. Would it not be right that those powers should be exercised by the new Minister for Scotland instead of by the Board of Trade?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, that in reply to the question of the hon. Member for Perth (Mr. Parker), the right of making bye-laws was always vested in the Local Authority. It had never struck him that the powers of inferior officers should be transferred to a superior Office such as was to be formed under this Bill. He would, however, look into the matter; but he could hold out no hope of any concession in regard to the point.

MR. C. S. PARKER asked if there was any reason for putting bye-laws for locomotives under one authority, and bye-laws for general traffic under another?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he thought there might be. In the discussion upon the Roads and Bridges Bill that had been clearly shown. With regard to the Board of Trade, he would ask his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Board to answer the question.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) said, the Board of Trade held the powers as to foreshores under the Crown Lands Act of 1853, and it would be impossible to transfer them without repealing that Act.

MR. BRYCE remarked, that the powers in regard to foreshores had been managed in a much more liberal spirit by the Board of Trade than by the Commissioners of Woods and Forests; and he hoped the Government would not make any alteration.

MR. BUCHANAN asked whether the duties of the Board of Trade with regard to the Commissioners of Northern Lights should not be transferred to the new Secretary?

[No reply.]

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Secretary to be Vice President of Scotch Education Department).

MR. PRESTON BRUCE said, he would not detain the Committee for more than two or three minutes in moving his Amendment to leave out the words "Vice President," in order to insert "President." He would simply explain briefly what the effect of the Amendment would be. As he understood the Bill, it really made the Secretary for Scotland a Vice President of the Council, and placed him in precisely the same relation to the Lord President as the Vice President of the Council the right hon. Member for Mid Lincoln (Mr. E. Stanhope) was in now. That was a position in some degree subordinate to the Lord President. The object of his Amendment, to substitute "President" for "Vice President," was to remove that position of subordination, and to make the Scotch Secretary an independent responsible Minister for Education in Scotland, exercising all the patronage, presiding over his own Department, and having an official staff in his own Office. He wished to remind hon. Members that the Childers Committee particularly condemned the present management of education in this respect, on account of the divided responsibility; but by this Bill they were again setting up a divided responsibility as regarded education in Scotland. They would, at the same time, only partially transfer the education of Scotland to the new Scotch Department. That was a very important matter, because he admitted that there might be certain dangers connected with the separation of Scottish education; but, on the other hand, there were certain advantages which he hoped would follow from the separation. He was afraid that a partial separation might result in their failing to get those advantages which they anticipated from the change. He did not understand, from the remarks of the Home Secretary, that the right hon. Gentleman was going to reject this Amendment on the ground of the impossibility, suggested in "another place," of there being two Presidents of the Council. It was well known that the President of the Board of Trade had been created an independent official by an Order in Council. As an Order in Council created a Committee of Council for Trade, with an independent President, he did not think there would be any difficulty in providing that the Secretary for Scotland should be President of the Scotch Education Department, as was suggested by the Amendment. He therefore begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 31, to leave out the words "Vice President," and insert the word "President."—(*Mr. Preston Bruce.*)

Question proposed, "That the words 'Vice President' stand part of the Clause."

Mr. MARJORIBANKS desired to say a few words in support of the Amendment of his hon. Friend. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had said just now that there were three parties in Scotland in regard to this matter—one party who desired that Scotch education should remain in the hands of the Vice President of the Council, as was suggested by the right hon. Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair); another party who went the whole way with the hon. Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce); and a third party who went in for the mean between the two extremes adopted by the Bill as it at present stood — namely, that the new Minister should be Vice President of the Scotch Council of Education. He quite admitted that there might be a party in Scotland who thought with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair) that Scotch education should be left, as at present, in the hands of the Vice President of the Council, and a large party who desired to see the whole of education given to the new Minister; but there was no party prepared to adopt the mean of giving the Scotch Secretary merely a limited control over education as this Bill proposed. He felt sure that if the Government did not give the new Minister sufficient control over Scotch education, they would find that the bottom would be knocked out of the tub altogether, and they would fall through. The people of Scotland were determined to have a Minister who would have full and complete control of Scotch education; and if they only got a small portion of what they desired under the Bill, there would very soon be an agitation for conferring increased powers upon the new Scotch Minister. The opposition to giving complete control over Scotch education to the new Scotch Minister came only from two quarters. One was the Departments.

He believed he was right in saying that the Home Office did not, on the whole, regard the Bill with very great favour; and he certainly knew that the Education Department objected strongly to this part of the Bill. ["No!"] Well, the late Education Department had done so. It was like a master of fox-hounds, who, when he once got hold of a large tract of country—whether he could hunt it or not he did not care a bit; but nothing would induce him to give it up. That was very much the case here. The Education Department had charge of Scotch Education, and they intended to keep it, in order to aggrandize and make strong their own Department. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for the University of Edinburgh (Sir Lyon Playfair) let the cat out of the bag last night. It was really a fight between those who desired to see a strong Scotch Minister and the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Sheffield (Mr. Mundella), who was lately at the head of the Education Department. There were certain persons who thought that if Scotch education were taken away, the Minister who it was proposed should succeed to the functions of Vice President of the Council would not get Cabinet rank. That was the moving spirit of the matter, as was apparent from the evidence before the Committee in regard to Scotland. If any-one would take the trouble to go through the evidence in regard to Scotland, he would find that there were great and important differences between English and Scotch education. Indeed, Sir Francis Sandford went so far as to say that it was impossible to carry out the system of Scotch education at all unless there were a separate set of Scotch officials to do the work. The right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster), in a speech which he delivered in 1879, said much the same thing. The right hon. Gentleman admitted that Scotch education was far ahead of English education; and he said, further, that the education imparted in the three countries was totally different, and that a similar system could not by any possible means be suitable for the Three Kingdoms. They had a system of education in Scotland of which they were very proud. It had a history which extended as far back as the 12th century. Since 1646 they had had a national system of education, and what they wanted to do was to keep that national system of education. What they felt was that Scotland had been "cabined, cribbed, and confined" by being tied up with England since 1872. They had been like a long-legged man tied up with a short-legged man in a trowser race. They had been kept back; and if England had improved her position with regard to education in comparison with Scotland, it had been because Scotland had been kept back more than England had. England had got on simply through the advantage she had enjoyed of being tied up with Scotland.

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR pointed out that the whole structure of the Bill was to create an Education Department for Scotland. If this Amendment were adopted, the effect would be that the Vice President of the Council became Vice President for England alone. But he had far more important duties to perform than the Vice President for Scotland, because the Vice President for England had charge of the Science and Art of the country, and he must send Inspectors down to Scotland to examine every school in Scotland for Art, and he hoped also for Science. Therefore, the Vice President for England had much larger powers than the Vice President for Scotland proposed to be created by this Bill. And yet they were asked, in carrying out a system of this kind, to make one Officer President of the Scotch Education Department, and the other only Vice President of the Council, with much more important and larger duties in connection with education. That was impossible, unless they altered the whole structure of the Bill. There was one thing which he wished the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill to consider. Personally, he was placed in a very awkward position, because he must vote for the Amendment of the hon. Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce). If he did not, the whole question would be determined. The retention of the words "Vice President" would determine the whole question, and, therefore, he must vote for the Amendment, in order to strike out the words "Vice President;" but he should oppose his hon. Friend most vehemently when he afterwards came to propose the insertion of the word "President." That was an awkward position, because he held one word to be as bad as the other.

Mr. RAMSAY said, he was not surprised to hear his right hon. Friend object to this Amendment. The Amendment itself was a very important one. His right hon. Friend said that it would place the President of the Scotch Education Department in a higher position than the Vice President of the English Department. No doubt, it would do so; and that was what the Scotch Members intended and desired. They desired that the Scotch Education Department should be entirely separate and distinct from England, and that it should have a President, with full power and control and all the patronage belonging to it. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) had said that it was desirable to postpone the real discussion until the Committee came to this Amendment. His hon. Friend had now submitted it, and he (Mr. Ramsay) supported it, because he felt that if the Secretary for Scotland were made the President of the Scotch Education Department, he would have the patronage. He should certainly vote with his hon. Friend, if, as he hoped, his hon. Friend took a division.

The PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. Balfour) said, the Government preferred the Bill as it at present stood. They preferred that the Scotch Minister in charge of education should be a Vice President rather than a President; but if that was objected to, they preferred that he should be a President in charge of education rather than an *ex officio* member. If, therefore, "Vice President" was struck out of the Bill, the Government would support the insertion of "President" as against "*ex officio* member."

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON said, that if this Amendment were carried, and the Officer was designated "President," the result would be that the Office of the President of the Scotch Education Department would be held in Edinburgh; there would be no sense in having an entirely separate Department, with patronage and everything else connected with it carried out in London, and not in Edinburgh. He believed there would be great inconvenience in the practical administration of the Office if this Amendment were adopted.

Mr. J. B. BALFOUR pointed out that his hon. and gallant Friend (Sir Alexander Gordon) was under a complete misapprehension; there was no intention on the part of the late Government to transfer to Edinburgh the administration of the Department. The Officer, whatever he might be designated, would remain in London. In regard to the effect that this Amendment, if carried, would have upon the general scheme of the Bill, it was right, perhaps, to distinguish between the position in which the Bill was now, and the position which it occupied in the beginning, and in the later stage, in which, rightly, he thought, an Amendment was introduced concerning the Department as distinguished from the individual. The intention, when the Bill was introduced, was to make the Secretary for Scotland the Educational Minister for Scotland; and there was not then any purpose to create a separate Department for him. It was pointed out in the House of Lords—and here he must say the Bill had been improved—that it would be desirable that the Scotch Secretary, in his capacity of Educational Minister for Scotland, should have associated with him a Department—ready made, so to say. The Earl of Rosebery accepted that suggestion; but he thought he was right in saying that the noble Earl had no idea or intention of suggesting that the Scotch Secretary should be a Vice President, because he brought down an Amendment designating him "President." It was when the noble Earl brought down that Amendment that the Lord President of the Council suggested that the word "Vice" should be introduced. Explanations were asked by the Earl of Rosebery as to what would take place by this change, and the impression was left on many minds that although the new Minister was to be designated "Vice President," he should be, in fact, Plenipotentiary *ad hoc*. On the third reading of the Bill in the other House there was certainly great reticence on the part of the President of the Council as to how much power the Vice President would have, and the net result of the discussion there was to show that if he were a Vice President he would be the subordinate in Scotch educational matters of the Lord President. That was certainly not the intention of a great many others who desired to see the Secretary for Scotland, by whatever name he was designated, the Educational Minister for Scotland, and the sole Educational Minister for Scotland. The prevailing opinion was that Scotch educational matters should be managed by a President of their own Department. The hon. Member for Fife (Mr. Preston Bruce) had pointed to the analogy of the Board of Trade; but he (Mr. J. B. Balfour) submitted that the proper course was to return to what was intended when the Amendment was introduced in the House of Lords, and to make this Officer in name, as it was intended he should be in substance, the Educational Minister for Scotland.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, the Scotch people wanted to have, practically speaking, a Committee of Scotch Education. The Government had never concealed their wish to meet the desires of the Scotch people; but, at the same time, he was bound to say the Government very much preferred that the new Minister should be Vice President rather than he should take the somewhat anomalous position of President of the Council, which would make two Presidents. Now, as to the peculiar position in which the Committee were at present placed. It was just as well they should understand exactly how they were going to vote. A difficulty had arisen as to how they could really obtain the sense of the Committee. The Motion before the Committee was, "That the words 'the Vice President' stand part of the Clause." Those who were favourable to the insertion of the words "*ex officio* member" would have to vote against the words "Vice President" standing part of the clause, and those who wished to insert "President" would have to do the same; therefore, if they did not take care, they would not arrive at what was the opinion of Scotch Members. Probably the best plan would be to take the sense of the Committee as between the words "Vice President" and "President," because it was clear that those who objected to the designation "the President," and preferred "*ex officio* member" or "Vice President," would have to vote in favour of the Motion, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. J. B. BALFOUR observed, that this would combine the two sections against the one.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) remarked, that that was the only way in which a proper decision might be arrived at.

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR said, that as he raised the difficulty, and it was a serious one, he thought it right to say that he should vote that the words "Vice President" stand part of the clause, and that when the clause itself was put, he would take a division in order to show the sense of the Committee.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Member (Mr. Preston Bruce) were to withdraw his Amendment, and move to omit the word "Vice," it would simplify matters between the three propositions.

MR. RAMSAY said, it did not appear to him that if the Minister were designated "President," any difficulty would arise. The Lord President of the Council would hold one Office, and the President of the Scotch Education Department another Office.

MR. PRESTON BRUCE said, he would be glad to adopt the suggestion of the Chairman, and asked leave to withdraw the Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: And then the hon. Gentleman will move to omit the word "Vice."

MR. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN thought that then the same confusion would arise. If the question were that the word "Vice" stood part of the clause, those who were in favour of "President" and those in favour of "*ex officio* member" would vote against it, so that in the end precisely the same difficulty would arise.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Member withdraw his Amendment?

MR. PRESTON BRUCE: It appears there would be no advantage in my doing so. In that case, I think I had better adhere to the Amendment as it stands.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 73; Noes 26: Majority 47.—(Div. List, No. 270.)

MR. J. A. CAMPBELL proposed to insert, after "Scotland," in line 34—

> "With a distinct permanent Secretary to attend to the business of Scotch Education."

The permanent official was not to be Secretary to the Secretary for Scotland, but an officer added to the Scotch Education Department. Whatever view hon. Members might have formed of the proper position of the Scotch Secretary with relation to education, this Amendment must commend itself to them.

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) asked if it was in Order for the hon. Member to move an Amendment imposing a charge without the money having been voted for that charge?

THE CHAIRMAN said, the House had resolved—

> "That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the salary of a Secretary for Scotland and of any officials who may be appointed under the provisions of any Act of the present Session for appointing the Secretary for Scotland and of any office expenses which may be incurred thereby."

Therefore, the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman was perfectly in Order.

MR. J. A. CAMPBELL said, that his Amendment was in accordance with the recommendations of the Committee to which reference had been made. It was remarkable, however, how differently those recommendations were at times regarded. Sometimes they were not considered worthy of attention, and at other times they were regarded by the same hon. Members as conclusive upon the particular matter in hand. The recommendation of the Committee was that the Officer who was in charge of education should be the real as well as nominal Minister, and that he should have the patronage in his hands. The same Committee recommended that there should be a distinct permanent Secretary appointed for the purpose of attending to Scotch education. He thought that as hon. Members had now approved of the proposal of the Bill that the Secretary for Scotland should be Vice President of the Scotch Education Department, there should be provided a permanent Secretary. He begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 34, after the word "Scotland," to insert the words "with a distinct permanent Secretary to attend to the business of Scotch Education."—(*Mr. J. A. Campbell.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he did not dispute for a moment that the Secretary for Scotland should have a permanent Secretary; but he did not think it would be right to insert such a Proviso here. By the 2nd clause of the Bill, which had already been passed, it was provided that the Secretary for Scotland might appoint what officers he deemed requisite. The appointment of a permanent Secretary, therefore, should be made under the 2nd clause of the Bill.

MR. RAMSAY said, there was good reason for refusing to accept his hon. Friend's Amendment. The appointment of a permanent Secretary was recommended by a Committee which had no regard for the feelings or opinions of the people of Scotland. The Committee did not examine a single witness; and therefore he was surprised that his hon. Friend should seek to impose on the face of this Bill the provision that there should be a distinct permanent Secretary, independent, apparently, of the Secretary for Scotland. He (Mr. Ramsay) hoped the Committee would not accept the Amendment.

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR said, the Scotch Members would lose the advantage of a distinct Scotch Education Department if they did not have a permanent Secretary of that Department. There might be a Secretary appointed to the Scotch Secretary; but this Amendment provided for the appointment of a Secretary to the Scotch Education Department, who would make it his special duty to attend to the business of the Department. Without such a Secretary the work might be done inside the English Education Department. He thought the Scotch Members would lose the whole substance of what they were contending for if they declined to accept the Amendment.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER believed it was a fact that the English Education Department had not a permament Secretary appointed by Statute. That being so, he could not understand why the appointment of a permanent Secretary to the Scotch Education Department should be made a statutory obligation. The Committee had decided that the Minister should be Vice President, and therefore it was rather too much to propose that there should be a statutory obligation to appoint a permanent Secretary. If the necessity arose for such an officer he would be appointed under the 2nd clause of the Bill.

MR. A. R. D. ELLIOT agreed very much with what had been said by his right hon. Friend (Sir Lyon Playfair) upon this matter. They must in these matters take the best they could get, and it seemed to him that by appointing a permanent Secretary something would be done towards obtaining a distinct administration of Scotch educational matters. He took this as a test of the *bona fides* of the Government, though he was sure they would act in good faith. He would like to know whether it was the intention of the Government to appoint a permanent Secretary, because, if so, they might be left to make the appointment?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, it was the intention of the Government that what he took to be the principle of the Bill—namely, that Scotch education should be presided over by a Scotch Minister, should be carried out. The arrangements necessary to insure that would form matter for future consideration.

DR. CAMERON thought the intentions of the Government were very clearly stated by the Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross). Referring to a previous Amendment, the right hon. Gentleman stated that the Mover of that Amendment evidently had not seen the Amendment to be proposed by the hon. Gentleman the Member for the Glasgow University (Mr. J. A. Campbell). The Government, the right hon. Gentleman said, intended to accept the Amendment. Of course, difficulties had arisen; but he thought it was evident from what the right hon. Gentleman had said that it was intended to have a permanent Secretary to attend to the business of Scotch education.

Amendment *negatived.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

SIR LYON PLAYFAIR said, he was unwilling at that late hour of the night to divide the Committee on the clause; but before they left the subject altogether he must say that, in his opinion, the Government had got the House into most embarrassing circumstances. They had appointed a Scotch Secretary, who was an independent Officer; they had given him a position as Vice President of the Committee on Scotch Education, under the Lord President as the superintendent Officer, and the way in which it was done appeared to him to create a great absurdity in the matter of administration. However, he did not suppose it would be of any use dividing the Committe—it would only waste time.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

SIR JOHN LUBBOCK: I challenged the clause.

THE CHAIRMAN: I understood that the hon. Baronet and the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce) both challenged the clause when I put it the first and the second times, but that afterwards they agreed. The clause is now agreed to.

MR. BUCHANAN said, he had a new clause to move touching the General Register House in the following terms:—

> "The Secretary shall have the control of the General Register House in Edinburgh, and of all the offices and Departments contained therein."

This matter was one of considerable interest in Scotland; and as there were several Offices concerned in addition to some of those which were under regular control, he thought it advisable that they should have some specific management. There was the Office of the Signet, the Great Seal Office, Lord Lyon, and other Offices connected with various other Departments. He believed it would be a great advantage to the work of those Departments which were under the Treasury if they were all put under the new Official. As that Secretary was to have control of Scotch matters, he thought it would be desirable that these Offices should be under his supervision; therefore, without detaining the Committee any longer, he would move the clause in his name.

New Clause:—

(General Register House.)

> "The Secretary shall have the control of the General Register House in Edinburgh, and of all the offices and Departments contained therein,"

—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he hoped the hon. Member would not press the Amendment. So far as the Register Office was concerned, as the hon. Member knew well enough, that was in the Schedule, although the General Register House in Edinburgh was not; but later on he intended to move to substitute it, and from the circumstances of the case he did not think it desirable that all the Departments contained therein should be included. That was his (Sir R. Assheton Cross's) opinion, and he trusted the Committee would agree with it. However, if the matter were put to a division he should go against it.

MR. J. B. BALFOUR also opposed the clause.

Question put, and *negatived.*

MR. PRESTON BRUCE said, he desired, in the Schedule, Part I., page 4, between lines 43 and 44, to insert "Industrial Schools, 29 & 30 Vic. c. 118, 35 & 36 Vic. c. 62," and he hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary would accept the Amendment. Surely the duty of looking after the Industrial Schools in Scotland should fall within the duties of this new Office, more especially in view of the fact that the Royal Commission on Industrial Schools had recommended that the subject of education in those schools should be brought under the Education Department. Surely it would be a very strange anomaly if the Secretary for Scotland, who had principally Home Office duties to discharge, and who had to do with Scotch education, should have nothing to do with those schools. He had not included Reformatory Schools; but, of course, if this Amendment were accepted, he should be prepared to do so.

Amendment proposed, Schedule, Part I., page 4, between lines 43 and 44, insert "Industrial Schools, 29 & 30 Vic. c. 118, 35 & 36 Vic. c. 62."—(*Mr. Preston Bruce.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he did not think that these Industrial Schools ought to be transferred to the new Secretary; but before giving a decided answer to the proposal he should prefer to have a correspondence with the Lord Advocate on the subject.

MR. J. B. BALFOUR said, that this matter had been carefully considered by the late Government, and a conclusion had been arrived at similar to that to which the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Assheton Cross) seemed to have almost come to. One of the main considerations had been in regard to the important function of clerking.

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. BUCHANAN said, he wished to have an explanation with regard to Amendments on the Paper in the name of the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Assheton Cross) — namely, Schedule, Part III., page 5, between lines 11 and 12, insert,—"Assessor of Railways and Canals, 17 & 18 Vic. c. 91, s. 29." Schedule, Part III., page 5, line 16, leave out "Register Office," and insert "General Register House in Edinburgh." Schedule, Part III., page 5, line 18, after "emoluments," insert "and with the consent of the Secretary, to regulate establishment." This appeared to be the part of the Schedule which transferred the Register House to the new Secretary. It appeared to him, so far as he could understand it, that they were rather restricting the control given to the Secretary under the Bill. Of course, the Treasury could reserve to itself the right to say what salaries were to be paid in every Department. He understood that the result of the Amendments of the Home Secretary would be that the Secretary for Scotland, instead of being the first motive power in regulating the establishments, would only have a consultative voice in the matter. The power of the new Secretary over the establishments by these Amendments would be lessened. He should like to have some explanation on the point.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) tendered an explanation.

MR. J. B. BALFOUR said, he quite agreed that when they came to deal with a purely Treasury matter like the salaries which should be paid the matter should be dealt with in the Bill as they had framed it. But if by the words "to regulate establishment" was meant that the Treasury was to retain the power of saying how many officers were to be appointed, or of pointing out the duties they were to discharge, he should think it would be a mistake. It would be a mistake, because he knew that there had been a great deal of difference of opinion upon this question. It had been thought too much power had been conferred on the Treasury by the Lord Clerk Register Act of 1879. Many people thought that too much power had been given to the Treasury, and would be averse to see their power extend beyond the question of regulating the salaries.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): I will not proceed with the Amendments now, but will postpone them until Report. In the meantime, I may have an opportunity of consulting with the Lord Advocate.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the right hon. Gentleman withdraw his Amendments now?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee that the Amendments be withdrawn?

Amendments, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

SEA FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT BILL [*Lords.*]

(*Baron Henry de Worms, Secretary to the Board of Trade.*)

COMMITTEE. [*Progress 29th July.*]

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 2 (Application).

MR. WILLIAMSON said, he begged to move the Amendment standing on the Paper in his name, in page 1, line 10, to leave out from "Scotland" to end of Clause.

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 10, to leave out from the word "Scotland" to end of Clause.—(*Mr. Williamson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD OF TRADE (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) said, he could not accept the Amendment, and pointed out that this part of the Bill was according to the Act of 1883.

MR. WILLIAMSON said, that the Act in question applied to the lettering of vessels, and also with reference to the Penal Clauses of the Fisheries Act. He had not thought it necessary to explain what he meant.

MR. J. B. BALFOUR said, he understood the proposal of the hon. Gentleman was to leave out the words which dealt with the exclusive limits of the British Islands and which defined the scope of the Act. No doubt, there were some parts which should not be excluded for certain purposes—that was to say, there were some parts of the Act which should apply outside the three-mile limit, in matters connected with trawling for instance. But the Amendment affected the whole scope of the Bill. He saw that the hon. Member opposite (Baron Henry De Worms) had an Amendment to a similar effect on the Paper.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS): No; my Amendment is in line 11, and not in line 10.

MR. J. B. BALFOUR: Then I agree with the hon. Member.

Amendment *negatived.*

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 11, to leave out from the word "Scotland" to end of Clause.—(*The Secretary, Baron Henry De Worms.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, he had a Notice on the Paper to move to add to the Clause, after line 12, the following words:—

> "Provided always, That damages done to nets, lines, gear, or boats by any mode of fishing in any part of the sea beyond the exclusive fishery limits of the British islands, may be prosecuted by order of the Fishery Board in such Sheriff Court as may be most convenient for the trial."

He had been told, however, that the Fisheries Act of 1883 provided for damage of this kind; and, on that understanding, he should not press his proposal on the Committee.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 3 *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Fishery Board may make bye-laws prohibiting or regulating trawling within defined areas).

MR. WILLIAMSON said, he desired to move, in line 18, to leave out the following words:—

"And within the exclusive Fishery limits of the British Islands."

He knew this was going outside the scope of the Bill; but they also knew that there was a great deal of conflict between trawlers and line fishermen outside the territorial waters, and if they regulated these matters within the limits, seeing that conflicts might as readily occur outside, he did not see why their regulations should not extend beyond those limits. He was perfectly satisfied that the clause as it stood would not satisfy the line fishermen who were liable to have their business interfered with by the trawlers. As to the difficulty of dealing with the fishermen outside their territorial waters, he would point out that the law of this country could follow a British ship all over the world and say she should not do damage to her neighbours. This was a question affecting the destruction of fishermen's gear. He would not take up any further time in explaining the Amendment, but would merely express his sincere hope that it would be accepted.

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 18, to leave out the words "and within the exclusive fishery limits of the British Islands."—(*Mr. Williamson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) said, he was afraid he could not agree to the Amendment proposed by the hon. Gentleman, and he thought the hon. Member himself had given sufficient grounds why it could not be accepted when he declared that it was not within the scope of the Bill. It would be absurd to go beyond the three-mile limit.

MR. MARJORIBANKS said, he should like to say a word upon this Amendment of his hon. Friend, and at the same time to appeal to other hon. Gentlemen who had Amendments to the clause down on the Paper. He (Mr. Marjoribanks) had been a Member of the Royal Commission on whose recommendations this Bill had been framed. They had considered this question most carefully, and had come to the conclusion that the utmost to which they could go was to recommend that the Scotch Fishery Board should have power to prohibit trawling within the three-mile limit.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, he objected to the hon. Member anticipating Amendments that were to come on afterwards.

MR. MARJORIBANKS said, he begged the hon. and gallant Member's pardon; but, as a matter of fact, the point was raised by the hon. Member for the St. Andrew's District (Mr. Williamson), who proposed to strike out from this clause all reference to territorial waters, and to leave the Act to apply to trawling, not only about their own shores, but in the North Sea and in the Atlantic. The Commission had considered the matter very carefully, and had thought it absolutely necessary to give the Scotch Fishery Board power and option to put a stop to trawling where they thought proper within territorial waters. That was a power which the Irish Fishery Inspectors had at present, and one which was exercised in a similar way in other countries. In France, for instance, trawling was prohibited within the three-mile limit unless a licence were given to the contrary. In parts of Germany there was a similar law; also in Denmark. Norway and Spain had no regulation of the sort. He thought they had better adhere to the clause as it stood in the Bill, and not attempt to go further.

MR. ASHER thought the exact meaning of this Amendment was somewhat overlooked. He desired to explain the position he took in regard to the Amendment, because he quite agreed with the Amendments which had been put down for excluding these words from several other clauses. There seemed to be one fatal objection to the exclusion of these words from this clause, and that was that they would be legislating upon a matter as to which the British Legislature had no power. This was not a clause dealing with the destruction of fishing gear, but it was a clause limited to the prohibition by the Scotch Fishery Board of trawling or other destructive modes of fishing. It was perfectly certain that the Scotch Fishery Board could not exercise that power except within the territorial waters. If the words were struck out, as proposed by his hon. Friend (Mr. Williamson), the clause would be made applicable to the sea outside the territorial waters in regard to which the Legislature of this country had not exclusive power.

MR. WILLIAMSON asked leave to withdraw the Amendment. He had thought it right to propose it, as he had a fishing constituency.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON moved to omit "fishing," in line 26, and insert "trawling." He did so, because the powers which it was proposed to give to the Fishery Board by this clause were very extensive, and were believed by fishermen to be very arbitrary. The men were afraid of the extent to which the powers might be exercised. The object of all this legislation was the protection of fishermen within the three-mile limit, or, in other words, within the territorial waters. The fishermen had complained of the damage done by trawlers, and the complaints had reached such a point that the late Government appointed a Commission to inquire into them. The Commissioners took a great deal of trouble, sitting for two years, and they presented a Report, and the result of that Report was this Bill. But the fishermen felt that by giving the Board this power they would have the power of stopping fishing on every ground in any area they thought proper. Now, if they restricted the fishing within a certain area, say, of 20 or 30 miles, they took away at once the whole means of livelihood of all the fishermen within that area. There was no provision for any compensation to the fishermen who might be deprived of their means of livelihood; and, therefore, what he proposed to do was to alter the word "fishing" to that of "trawling." That would enable the Board to stop trawling wherever they thought proper under the powers of the Act; but it would not give them power to stop fishing, by which so many men obtained their livelihood. This Amendment was so obviously just that he hoped it would be accepted by the Committee.

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 26, to leave out the word "fishing," and insert the word "trawling."—(*Sir Alexander Gordon.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'fishing' stand part of the Clause."

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) said, he could not accept the Amendment of the hon. and gallant Gentleman. The Commission was not directed against any particular kind of fishing, but was appointed to inquire into the general effects of fishing or trawling. It appeared to him that if they were to agree to the Amendment proposed, they would go directly against the principal object of the Bill.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON remarked, that the principal object of the Bill was to protect the in-shore fishermen against trawlers. That was the sole object of this legislation, and the fishermen would be very much disappointed if some such Amendment as this were not accepted. No fisherman could be injured if the power were taken from the Board to stop fishing. He was sorry the hon. Gentleman could not agree to the proposal.

Amendment *negatived.*

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, the next Amendment was a very important one, and one which he hoped the hon. Gentleman would be able to agree to. It was to the effect that the byelaws which the Fishery Board were empowered to make by this Bill should not allow trawling by any trawler with a beam of greater length than 12 feet. It was trawlers with huge beams of from 30 to 40 and 50 feet long which did all the damage; and, therefore, if the prohibition he suggested were made, the fishermen round the coast would have secured all they wanted. The hon. Member for Ross-shire (Mr. Munro-Ferguson) had an Amendment to the same effect. The hon. Member was largely interested in fishermen, the same as he (Sir Alexander Gordon) was. Between them they had more fishermen under their observation than any other two Members in that House. Now, what the fishermen asked to be protected from were the huge machines which came sweeping the whole floor of the sea, and did thereby so much damage. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Berwickshire (Mr. Marjoribanks), addressing his constituents on Saturday last, said—

> "As regards the exhaustion of fishing grounds by trawlers they had the clearest evidence, and he did not think there could be the least doubt that in the Firth of Forth the

number of fish had been decidedly and considerably reduced by the action of trawlers in inshore waters. There had been a marked diminution of fish, and the Commissioners recommended in regard to that that the Scotch Fishery Board should have the power entirely to prohibit trawling in the territorial waters in the United Kingdom."

All he (Sir Alexander Gordon) asked was that that House should do themselves what they empowered the Fishery Board to do, because if they did it here it would be done. The Fishery Board would find great difficulty in giving any order to that effect, owing to the powerful influence the trawlers possessed. The trawlers were a wealthy body, the fishermen were poor; the trawlers were to be found in towns, and the fishermen all round the coast, the latter having few people to speak for them. He asked the Committee to do what he suggested, as an effectual means of protecting the fishermen from injury.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 28, after second "bye-laws," to add—"Provided, That such bye-laws shall not sanction any fishing, within the exclusive fishery limits of Scotland, with a trawl having a beam of a greater length than twelve feet, and all trawling, within the above named limits, with a trawl having a beam of a greater length than twelve feet is hereby declared to be illegal after the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six."—(*Sir Alexander Gordon.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) said, it was quite impossible to agree to this Amendment. While by his proposal the hon. and gallant Gentleman would do justice to a certain class of fishermen, he would do great injustice to others. The object of the Bill was not, as the hon. and gallant Gentleman stated, to do away with trawling, but to ascertain what kinds of fishing were injurious. They were not sure of the amount of damage done by trawling, and therefore it was not right they should limit the length of beam.

MR. ASHER said, this Amendment raised the very important question whether trawling should or should not be abolished within the territorial limits. There was no doubt that it was within the power of the Legislature of this country to entirely prohibit trawling within the territorial waters. He had said outside the House, and he desired to repeat inside the House, that, in his opinion, it would have been a more satisfactory settlement of this matter if the Trawling Commission had dealt with this question in a bolder form, and had recommended the abolition of trawling altogether within the territorial waters. He had a very strong belief that that prohibition would not in any way interfere with the successful prosecution of trawling, and the adequate supply of fish, through the means of trawling, to the markets of the country; and, on the other hand, he had a strong belief that it would have prevented great injustice and injury, which it was desirable to obviate, as regarded line fishing in many estuaries and bays from which he thought trawlers should be altogether excluded. But whilst these were his views on the question, he was bound to look at this matter from a practical point of view. At this period of the Session they were practically in this position—that they must accept the Bill substantially as it stood, or make up their minds not to have it at all. Looking to the terms in which the Royal Commission on Trawling reported, he could not say he entertained any hope of being able to carry his views about the prohibition of trawling within the territorial waters to any successful issue; and, therefore, regarding the Bill, as he did, as a step in the right direction, and believing that it was calculated to be beneficial in its results, he did not propose to press his views, but to accept the clause as it stood. But there was one matter which he thought it was right to bring forward. This clause proposed to impose a very onerous and difficult duty upon the Scotch Fishery Board—namely, that of investigating and deciding within what portions of the sea within the territorial waters trawling or other injurious methods of fishing ought to be prohibited. It was quite evident that that was a matter which could not be decided by the Scotch Fishery Board without elaborate investigation; and, in his opinion, a serious objection to the Bill was that it contained no provision for supplying the Scotch Fishery Board with the necessary funds for enabling them to discharge this duty imposed upon them by Clause 4. He was quite aware it was not within the competency of a private Member to propose the introduction of a clause to rectify this defect; but he alluded to the matter now in order to point out to the Government the necessity of keeping this fact in view. He hoped the Government would, by arrangement with the Treasury, see their way to authorize the Scotch Fishery Board to undertake the investigations necessary under this clause, and to provide the Board with the necessary funds for the purpose. He trusted that before this clause passed the Committee would receive an assurance from some Member of the Government that the point to which he had referred would not be lost sight of.

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. WILLIAMSON proposed, in line 28, after second "bye-laws" to insert—

"It shall also be in the power of the Fishery Board, subject to confirmation as hereinafter mentioned, to prohibit steam trawlers from trawling at night, between sunset and sunrise, on fishing grounds or banks largely frequented by line or drift net fishing vessels, during such time or such part of the year as the Board may consider expedient."

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) said, he could not agree to the Amendment.

Amendment *negatived.*

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) proposed to insert, in page 2, after line 7—

"The Secretary of State shall allow any person to make a representation for his interest against the confirmation of any bye-law, on a notice of objection being given by such person to the Fishery Board within the said period of one month, and may, if he see fit, allow parties to be heard thereon."

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR considered that by this Amendment the hon. Gentleman was striking a great blow at the authority of the Fishery Board.

MR. WILLIAMSON said, that, undoubtedly, very onerous and delicate duties were imposed on the Fishery Board by this Bill. He was obliged to the hon. and learned Member for Elgin (Mr. Asher) for having brought those duties before the notice of the Committee; and all he could say was that the Fishery Board would do their best to discharge them faithfully and well. He did not see that any reasonable objection could be raised to this Amendment.

Amendment *agreed to.*

On Motion of the SECRETARY to the BOARD (Baron Henry De Worms), the following Amendment made:—Page 2, line 22, to leave out "by any officer of the Fishery Board."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 5 (Steam trawlers fishing off Scotland to have letters and numbers painted on the quarter).

MR. WILLIAMSON proposed to omit from line 28, "and within the exclusive fishery limits of the British Islands." The hon. Gentleman explained that this Amendment referred to the painting of letters on vessels.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 28, to leave out the words "and within the exclusive fishery limits of the British Islands."—(*Mr. Williamson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. MARJORIBANKS hoped the Government would consent to the Amendment.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. MARJORIBANKS proposed to insert, after "ground," in line 34, "on the funnel twelve inches from the top, and." He said, that the rule with regard to sailing vessels was that they had to paint numbers and letters on the bow and also on the sails. There was no doubt that the numbers being marked on the sails were very distinctive emblems seen at a considerable distance. The steam trawlers had no sails, therefore he thought the numbers should be painted on the funnels. It would be a great advantage to fishermen, inasmuch as it would help them to identify vessels which did them damage.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 34, after the word "ground," to insert the words "on the funnel twelve inches from the top, and."—(*Mr. Marjoribanks.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. WILLIAMSON proposed to insert, after "officers," in page 3, line 5, "or officers of the Fishery Board."

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 5, after the word "officers," to insert the words "or officers of the Fishery Board."—(*Mr. Williamson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) opposed the Amendment.

Amendment *negatived.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

MR. WILLIAMSON said, he must insist that the point he had just raised should be considered; if it was not, he would move that the clause be rejected. He would like to know whether the Board of Trade meant to put the Sea Fishery officers under the orders of the Fishery Board, because at present they were not? The men who attended to the numbering and lettering on the Coast of Scotland were the Fishery Board officers. If the Board of Trade would omit the section, all would be right.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) said, he would be very happy to consider the matter by Report.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Fishery Board may require statistics of sea fisheries).

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON proposed to leave out "fishermen," in page 3, line 6, and insert "fish salesmen." He wished to impress upon the Committee the fact that very great labour was entailed on the fishermen by the keeping account of all the fish they caught. A very large meeting of fishermen was held recently at Stornoway, and, amongst several objections to this Bill, this was particularly mentioned. It was pointed out that, after having been one or two nights out, the men came in very tired; but, before they could seek rest, they had to take an account of the fish they had caught. The duty was very irksome to them. He would like the hon. Gentleman (Baron Henry De Worms) to explain whether he intended an account to be kept of the fish caught in territorial water or in off-shore water, or whether separate accounts were to be kept of fish caught in territorial water and of that caught in off-shore water? He had never heard that the Returns now presented to Parliament from time to time were incorrect or insufficient; but he thought that, if any more were wanted, they ought to be got from the persons who cured the fish or from those who sold it.

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 6, to leave out the word "fishermen," and insert the words "fish salesmen."—(*Sir Alexander Gordon.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'fishermen' stand part of the Clause."

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) said, the Amendment would defeat one of the principal objects of the Bill, and, therefore, he could not accept it.

MR. R. W. DUFF hoped his hon. and gallant Friend (Sir Alexander Gordon) would not press the Amendment. At the Conferences at the Fisheries Exhibition, it was universally admitted that, in statistical information, we were behind other nations. The Scotch Fishery Board had succeeded in getting much better statistics concerning fisheries than were got in any other part of the Kingdom, and this clause would assist them in getting still better statistics.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, the hon. Gentleman (Mr. R. W. Duff) talked about fishing; but he did not know much about it. By this clause they imposed a very irksome duty upon Scotch fishermen, a duty which was not imposed on English fishermen. The fishermen of Scotland asked very earnestly that Parliament would not pass this clause; therefore, he could not withdraw the Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

On Motion of Mr. ASHER, the following Amendments made:—Page 3, after line 7, insert "and other person belonging to British sea fishing boats, and all;" line 8, leave out "and other person."

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR moved, in page 3, line 17, after the word "returns," to insert "or compilation thereof as may be agreed upon with the Board of Trade." He hoped the Secretary to the Board of Trade would assent to the Amendment, as a compilation prepared by competent authorities would be very useful.

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 17, after the word "returns," to insert the words "or compilation thereof as may be agreed upon with the Board of Trade."—(*General Sir George Balfour.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) thought it would be perfectly useless to do what was suggested.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR: Can you tell me what use they make of them at present?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS): I do not know.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR: You could get Reports from 50 places.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON wished to know whether the hon. Gentleman could not promise to let them have these Returns published by the Board of Trade during the herring fishery season? If Returns were to be made at all, they might as well be made use of; and it would be to the advantage of the fish curers if the Board of Trade would once a week, during the fishery season, publish the Returns which their officers made. It would be of very great use to the fish curers, who could arrange their sales accordingly. He would be glad if the hon. Gentleman would bear this in mind at the next herring fishery season.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) said, he would be very glad to see what could be done in the matter.

MR. WILLIAMSON said, it would be quite impossible to get the Returns from the Fishery Board every week, or even every month. What the Fishery Board did was to prepare the Returns annually.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, there would be no difficulty whatever. He knew the Fishery Board could not publish them; but they could return them to the Board of Trade, who could publish them without any difficulty.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR was willing to withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Sea fishery officer may award compensation under ten pounds).

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) moved, in page 3, at beginning of clause, to insert—

"Every case under the Sea Fisheries Acts may be prosecuted in any sheriff court which the Fishery Board may declare, by a notice under the hand of the Secretary to the Board to the Procurator Fiscal of such sheriff court, to be the court nearest to the spot where the offence was committed, or otherwise the most convenient for the trial of the case."

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON wished to have the closing words of the Amendment made clear. Did "most convenient" bear reference to the convenience of the prosecutor, or the convenience of the person accused? The convenience of the person accused ought to be more considered than the convenience of anybody else?

MR. J. B. BALFOUR said, there must be a balance of convenience.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON asked whether it was not the custom that all these crimes were tried at the nearest Court?

MR. MARJORIBANKS said, the ordinary practice was that all these cases were tried at the nearest possible place to the place where the offence was committed.

Amendment *agreed to.*

On Motion of Mr. ASHER the following Amendment made:—Page 3, line 23, after "person," insert "belonging to a British sea fishing boat."

MR. ASHER moved, in page 3, line 24, to leave out "and within the exclusive fishery limits of the British Islands." He pointed out that, although it was necessary to prevent the provisions of the Bill from coming in conflict with the International Convention, the section would not answer the purpose it was intended to serve, unless it was made applicable to cases of damage to fishing gear which occurred outside their territorial waters.

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 24, to leave out the words "and within the exclusive fishery limits of the British Islands."—(*Mr. Asher.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The SECRETARY to the BOARD (Baron Henry De Worms) said, it was impossible to accept this Amendment, for, by accepting it, they would be doing that which was contrary to the Act of 1883. Foreigners could only be dealt with when they came within our three-mile limit. If this Amendment were made the effect would be to extend the operation of the clause beyond the three-mile limit.

Mr. ASHER said, his first Amendment, which had been accepted, limited the clause to the case of a person belonging to the British sea fishing trade. The effect of both Amendments, taken together, would be that where damage was done to fishing gear, either within or without the three-mile limit, by anybody belonging to the home fishing trade, then the fishery officer could award the compensation. No doubt, if the section applied to foreign boats it would be against the Convention and beyond the power of the Legislature; but we had jurisdiction over our own fishing boats outside the territorial waters just as well as within them.

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. ASHER moved, in page 3, line 30, after the word "writing," to insert the words—

> "To make such examination or inquiry into the said complaint as he deems necessary, and."

He said these were merely formal words in order to make the language of the clause more distinct.

Amendment proposed,

> In page 3, line 30, after the word "writing," to insert the words "to make such examination or inquiry into the said complaint as he deems necessary, and."—(*Mr. Asher.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. MARJORIBANKS moved, in page 3, line 31, after the word "heard," to insert—

> "To award damages to the complainer to an amount not exceeding ten pounds, and to issue a certificate to that effect, and such certificate shall be final, and shall entitle the complainer to obtain, by action in the Small Debt Court, a decree for the sum specified therein; but when the amount of damage so inquired into shall exceed ten pounds, it shall be lawful for the sea fishery officer."

He thought this Amendment was one of very great importance. It would make a provision, which was included in the Bill as drawn by the late Lord Advocate, and as introduced into the House of Lords, carrying out one of the strongest recommendations of the Report of the Royal Commission that British sea fishery officers should be made a sort of floating magistracy. The men whom the Select Committee had in their eye were those commanders of Her Majesty's cruisers who were detailed for fishery purposes, and the recommendation was made with the object of securing to the injured fishermen as brief and easy a remedy, both for himself and the party charged with injuring him, as could possibly be obtained. The easiest way of doing that was to give to the British sea fishery officers power to deal with the cases summarily where only a small amount of damage was concerned. Those officers had now very considerable powers, of search, of examination upon oath, and in many other respects. They had even now powers to arbitrate, and decide those cases where the parties on both sides consented, and the Amendment would not give them any very great addition to their powers. It would be of the greatest advantage in keeping order between the different classes of fishermen on their coasts.

Amendment proposed,

> In page 3, line 31, after the word "heard," to insert the words "to award damages to the complainer to an amount not exceeding ten pounds, and to issue a certificate to that effect, and such certificate shall be final, and shall entitle the complainer to obtain, by action in the Small Debt Court, a decree for the sum specified therein; but when the amount of damage so inquired into shall exceed ten pounds, it shall be lawful for the sea fishery officer."—(*Mr. Marjoribanks.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. ASHER hoped the Government would accept the Amendment. It would be of considerable importance in dealing with one of the greatest grievances which the line fishermen experienced at the hands of the trawlers. There were a number of cases where the men would rather suffer damage than incur the expense of prosecution, and the Amendment would provide a short, summary method of recovering the damage where it had been sustained. The fishery officers were well qualified to assess the damage in such cases. He regarded the proposal as one of the most important provisions in the whole Bill, and he hoped it would be accepted.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON also hoped the Government would accept the Amendment.

LORD ELCHO also supported the Amendment, as he believed the fishermen felt very keenly about it.

MR. PRESTON BRUCE supported the Amendment, which would only put the Bill back into the form in which it was originally drawn, and satisfy one of the recommendations of the Select Committee.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) was sorry he could not accept the Amendment. The proposal was struck out after discussion in the House of Lords. If it were re-inserted it would restore the Bill to its original position; and, in point of fact, it would make the fishery officer a judge. He was astonished to hear the hon. and learned Member the late Solicitor General for Scotland (Mr. Asher) advocating such a very serious departure from the ordinary administration of the law. It was impossible for the Government to accept the proposal.

MR. R. W. DUFF wished to know whether the hon. Gentleman (Baron Henry De Worms) would consider what the meaning of "sea fishery officer" was under the Bill, for there was some confusion about that? There seemed to be some impression that the "sea fishery officer" would be an officer under the Fishery Board; but under the Bill he would be an officer belonging to the Coastguard. Some confusion arose on this point in "another place," and that was the reason why the proposal was not accepted there.

MR. MARJORIBANKS said, that under the Act of 1883 "sea fishery officers" were divisional officers of the Coastguard, commanders of Her Majesty's cruisers for deep sea fishery purposes, and officers appointed by the Board of Trade.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) could not depart from the opinion he had expressed. He did not think these officers were legally qualified to act as judges.

MR. MUNRO-FERGUSON hoped the Amendment would be accepted. It was of the utmost importance to the fishermen that they should have some such simple and easy and expeditious method of recovering slight damages.

MR. WILLIAMSON said, the officers might be looked upon as arbiters in dispute—not judges.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 15; Noes 39: Majority 24.—(Div. List, No. 271.)

On Motion of the SECRETARY to the BOARD (Baron Henry De Worms), the following verbal Amendments made:—Page 3, line 27, leave out the word "said sea;" line 37, leave out the word "officer;" line 37, after "fishery," insert "Board;" page 4, line 1, after "evidence," insert "on the question of the damage."

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) moved, in page 4, line 2, after the word "cause," to insert the words—

> "And in any case in which the damage, as found by the sheriff before whom the case comes for trial, shall exceed twelve pounds, appeal shall be competent as in ordinary causes before the sheriff court."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 8 and 9 *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Transfer of powers of Board of Trade).

MR. WILLIAMSON moved, in page 4, line 21, to insert the following subsection:—

> "(d.) The Board of Trade is also hereby authorized to delegate to the Fishery Board, for such time as it may see fit, powers to allocate, let, and manage the foreshores belonging to the Crown, or any portions of the same, for the special purpose of improving and extending oyster and mussel fisheries and bait beds, any rents collected to be accounted for to the Board of Trade, and the powers delegated to be exercised subject to the confirmation and approval of the said Board."

He said this was merely a civil request to the Board of Trade to allow the Fishery Board to do part of their work.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS): I cannot accept the Amendment.

MR. WILLIAMSON: Then I withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) moved, after Clause 7, to insert the following clause:—

(Procedure when person injured claims damages.)

"Sub-section (1) of Clause fifteen of 'The Sea Fisheries Act, 1883,' is hereby repealed.

"Where any offence is committed, as set forth in Clause seven hereof, it shall be competent for the person whose property has been injured to give notice in writing to the person committing such offence, and to the sheriff clerk, that at the trial of said offence the sheriff will be called upon to consider and dispose of the question of damages, and, in such case, the evidence led at said trial shall be evidence for the consideration of the sheriff on the question of damages, and the sheriff, at the conclusion of the said trial, shall proceed according to the provisions of Clause seven hereof, and shall, if oral evidence is to be taken on the question of damages, allow the accused person to be examined as a witness on the question of damages."

New Clause *brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

MR. ASHER said, there were three clauses which had been placed upon the Paper upon this subject, and the difference between them was very much a matter of drafting. He himself had put down a clause; but after carefully considering that of the hon. Gentleman he should not press his own. However, there might be serious difficulties in the way of working the clause now proposed if its exact words were retained, because he doubted very much whether it contained the necessary enacting words to enable the Sheriff to do the work imposed upon him. His (Mr. Asher's) clause had been framed so as to include what was necessary to produce the effect which was clearly intended.

MR. WILLIAMSON said, he also had a clause on the Paper on the same subject. If the clause proposed by the Government were accepted it would have to be remedied in one respect. In the second line were the words, "the person whose property has been injured." The Fisheries Act referred to the person as well as the property; and he would suggest that the words should be, "the person who has suffered injury," which would cover both the property and the person.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) said, he had contemplated making that change; and he proposed to substitute the words, "who has been injured," and also proposed to add, at the end of the clause—

"And shall proceed, after hearing the parties, to give decree as in an ordinary case before the sheriff court."

Perhaps those changes would meet the views which had been expressed.

MR. ASHER wished to call attention to that part of the clause which directed the Sheriff to proceed according to the provisions of Clause 7. Now, Clause 7 simply regulated the duty of the fishery officer. Was the Sheriff to convert himself into a fishery officer, and proceed to do a fishery officer's duties? The words were unintelligible.

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS) said, that if the clause were adopted he would consider it on Report, with the view of making any necessary alteration.

On Motion of the SECRETARY to the BOARD (Baron Henry De Worms), Clause amended by striking out the words "whose property has been injured," and inserting "who has been injured," and by adding at the end the words—

"And shall proceed, after hearing the parties, to give decree, as in an ordinary case before the sheriff court."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to*, and *added* to the Bill.

Preamble *agreed to.*

Bill *reported;* as amended, to be considered upon *Thursday*, and to be *printed.* [Bill 258.]

LABOURERS (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

(*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland.*)

[BILL 68.] CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Clause 12 (Provisional Order may be confirmed by the Privy Council).

MR. SEXTON said, he had an alteration to propose in the clause in order to make it correspond with the 2nd clause of the Bill, as amended in Committee.

Amendment proposed, in page 5, line 22, to leave out the word "less," and insert the word "more,"—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'less' stand part of the Clause."

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, he could not assent to the alteration proposed by the hon. Member for Sligo. He considered that the word "less" ought to stand part of the clause, because the change agreed to last night in Committee related to a different matter altogether.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he had considered this Amendment, and found it to be exactly the same in character as that agreed to in Committee.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 17 (Miscellaneous amendments of Act of 1883).

Amendment proposed,

In page 10, lines 10 and 11, to leave out the words "peace of the county," and insert the word "Union."—(*Mr. P. J. Power.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, he objected to the principle of this Amendment. The Amendment, besides, would not agree with the wording of the clause. There were many Unions in the various counties.

MR. SEXTON said, it was quite clear that the wording was right, because no scheme could extend beyond the Union.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, there was a Clerk of the Peace or Union; but there was no such thing as a Union of a county.

MR. SEXTON assured the hon. and gallant Member for Dublin County that if he examined the clause carefully he would see that the term was correct.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect of two New Clauses."—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

COLONEL KING-HARMAN proposed to amend the Motion by leaving out "two," and inserting "four."

Amendment proposed, to leave out the word "two," and insert the word "four,"—(*Colonel King-Harman,*)—instead thereof.

Question, "That the word 'two' stand part of the Bill," put, and *negatived.*

The word "four" *inserted.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Bill *re-committed* in respect of four New Clauses: *considered* in Committee.

New Clause (Closing of dwellings unfit for habitation,)—*brought up*, and read the first and second time, and *added* to the Bill.

New Clause (Area of charge for rate levied by Sanitary Authority,)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

MR. SEXTON said, that this clause was discussed in Committee, and, he thought, generally recognized that the Local Authorities, who were responsible to the ratepayers, were the best judges of the charge.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, it would be within the recollection of the House that it had been suggested that the rating should be made upon the Union instead of upon the electoral division. After some discussion upon the point, the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) suggested that the matter should be left to the discretion of the Sanitary Authority. He (the Attorney General for Ireland) had made inquiries, and had been informed by the Local Government Board that at the present time the matter was to all intents and purposes within the control of the Sanitary Authorities. That being so, there could be no objection to this clause.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Clause *added* to the Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: Where are the other clauses?

COLONEL KING-HARMAN: I do not move them.

Bill *reported;* as amended, *considered.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) [SALARIES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the Salaries of additional Members of the Irish Land Commission, and of any Officers who may be appointed under the provisions of any Act of the present Session for providing greater facilities for the sale of Land to occupying tenants in Ireland.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at half after
Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, 5*th August,* 1885.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Public Works Loans * (234); Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2) * (235).

Second Reading — Committee negatived — Third Reading—Revising Barristers * (225), and *passed.*

Committee—Report — Telegraph Acts Amendment * (230); Expiring Laws Continuance (229).

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

(*The Earl of Iddesleigh.*)

(NO. 229.) COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Clauses 1 and 2 severally *agreed to.*

Lord DENMAN, after presenting a Petition from ladies in Kensington in favour of extending the franchise to women, moved to insert in the Ballot Act an Amendment declaring that all women not legally disqualified, and who had the same qualification as the present electors, should have the right to vote at Parliamentary elections. With reference to the statement made by the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees (the Earl of Redesdale) on a previous occasion, when a similar Amendment had been moved, he declared that it was a dangerous thing to lay down the principle that no alteration could be made in any of the Acts included in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. He submitted that if his Amendment were accepted it would set a difficult question at rest for ever. Both sides of the House, he thought, were agreed as to the justice of his demand, and he hoped to see women on the Parliamentary Register either this year or next.

Amendment *moved,* after Clause 2 add the following clause:—

"Provided that the Act 35 & 36 Vict. c. 33, continued as aforesaid, shall be hereby extended so as to admit all women not leglly disqualified who have the same qualification as the present electors for counties and boroughs to vote for the election of Members of Parliament for counties and boroughs."—(*The Lord Denman.*)

Amendment *negatived.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment; and to be read 3ª *To-morrow.*

The CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES (The Earl of Redesdale) repeated that it was against every rule and practice to attempt to amend an Act in the Expiring Laws Continuance Bill. It would be extremely injurious to legislation if anyone could get up and move extravagant Amendments to existing measures. It would be adding new legislation to continued legislation; and if the principle were adopted it would lead to a great many hurried and faulty Acts being passed.

Lord DENMAN said, he looked upon the principle laid down by the noble Earl as most tyrannical, as if every continued Act were stereotyped, so a hundred bad measures might all be grouped, as was attempted in the Bankruptcy Bill of 1832. The new legislation of a retiring pension of £6,000 a-year might be carried, as was attempted by Lord Brougham, in a Bill for Bankruptcy, which had passed the House of Lords. As it was, however, the country had come round to his views on nearly every question upon which they had differed hitherto. He was now an old man, being 80 years of age, and he desired to see this measure of justice to females aimed at by the Amendment passed before he died.

House adjourned at half past Two
o'clock, till To-morrow,
Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 5*th August,* 1885.

MINUTES.]—Private Bills (*by Order*) — *Third Reading* — Ramsden Estate, and *passed.*

Considered as amended—Third Reading—Manchester Ship Canal,* and *passed.*

Public Bills—*Second Reading* — Registration Appeals (Ireland) * [259].

Committee—Police Enfranchisement Extension [219], *debate adjourned.*
Considered as amended—Third Reading—Federal Council of Australasia * [165]; Secretary for Scotland * [242], and *passed.*
Third Reading—Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) * [233]; Consolidated Fund (Appropriation); East India (Army Pensions Deficiency) * [225].
Withdrawn — Universities (Scotland) * [115]; Factory Acts (Extension to Shops) * [23].

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

——o——

RAMSDEN ESTATE BILL [*Lords*] (*by Order.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Sir Charles Forster.*)

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, he rose to move that the Bill be re-committed in respect of Clause 5, which authorized the expenditure of a sum of £50,000 in the purchase of land near Huddersfield, to be settled as part of the Ramsden Estates. He had called the attention of the House to this matter yesterday; and, therefore, it was not necessary that he should trouble it with more than a few words upon the subject now. Hon. Members would be aware that last year the House unanimously adopted a Standing Order, on his Motion, which provided that the Chairman of Ways and Means should, in the case of a Private Estate Bill being brought before Parliament, which involved any extension of the area of settled land, make such Bill the subject of a special Report. In regard to this Bill, the Chairman of Ways and Means had thought proper to make such a Report to the House; and, therefore, having regard to that Report, he (Mr. Arthur Arnold) felt it his duty to raise an objection to the measure, because he conceived that although the terms of the Report were somewhat vague, it was clear, from the fact that a Report had been submitted, that it was considered by the Chairman of Ways and Means to come within the Standing Order. By Clause 5 of the Bill power was given, under the authority of Parliament, to extend the area of land under settlement. There could be no question about that, or the Chairman of Ways and Means would not have felt it his duty to make a Report. Some hon. Members might not agree with the opinions he held on the subject; but, to his mind, any facilities that were afforded for the settlement of land were highly objectionable, and an evil which ought to be resisted in the interests of the people at large. He therefore proposed to take a division on the Motion now made, in order that he might emphasize, by all the means in his power, his objection to the settlement of land; and he trusted that he would receive the support of all who were in favour of land reform.

Mr. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member move to re-commit the Bill?

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD: Yes.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the words "now read the third time," in order to add the words "re-committed in respect of Clause 5,"—(*Mr. Arthur Arnold,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words 'now read the third time' stand part of the Question."

The CHAIRMAN of COMMITTEES (Sir Arthur Otway) said, he was not surprised that his hon. Friend should have taken the steps he had taken in regard to this Estate Bill, when it was remembered that it was at the instance of his hon. Friend that the Standing Order was passed last year, and that this was the first occasion on which that Standing Order had been put in force. He was not surprised, therefore, that the hon. Gentleman should have taken the opportunity of calling attention to this provision of the Bill. But he hoped to be able in a very few words to dissipate all the apprehensions of his hon. Friend, and to show the House that there was no reason whatever why they should adopt the Motion of his hon. Friend, and re-commit the Bill. It was perfectly true, as his hon. Friend said, that the Bill proposed to tie up some land in the neighbourhood of Huddersfield, which at present was not in the position of settled land; but his hon. Friend had omitted to state that in this instance the principle in regard to the settlement of land, to which his hon. Friend had so often called the attention of the House, was not in any way violated by the provisions of the present Bill. The trustees of the Ramsden Estates had power at present to entail and settle certain lands, and to purchase and settle other land in the neighbourhood of the family estates, in the parish of Byram. And what was simply proposed to be done by this Bill was this. A sum of £50,000 had been authorized to be raised under an Act of 1867, and with that money were empowered to purchase land in connection with the Byram Estates. The Bill now before the House simply provided that this sum of £50,000 might be expended in the purchase of land in connection with the Huddersfield, instead of the Byram Estates. The land at Huddersfield did not exceed in any way in area the land which would have been purchased in connection with the Byram property. On the contrary, it was somewhat less, and therefore the area of land tied up under the provisions of the Bill would not in reality be so large as the trustees of the Ramsden Estates were already empowered to purchase at Byram. He sympathized very much with the object of the hon. Member in regard to the settlement of land; but there was one argument used by his hon. Friend, when the Bill was before the House yesterday, which, in his (Sir Arthur Otway's) opinion, was altogether bad. His hon. Friend alleged that as land at Huddersfield was of greater value than land at Byram for building purposes there was a very strong objection to such land being tied up. His answer to that objection was that his hon. Friend was labouring under a delusion, and that the Act already passed authorized the purchase by the trustees of the Ramsden Estates of a certain amount of land to be placed in settlement. The Bill was a Lords Bill, and had come down to him as a Lords Bill, which had not only been passed by a Committee of that House after careful examination, but had also been examined by the Judges. When it came before him, he required evidence as to the examination it had received, and he was told that the Bill had been thoroughly investigated before it received the approval of the Lords' Committee. Therefore, looking at the fact that it involved no extension of area whatever, that it simply enabled a certain sum of money to be expended in connection with one part of Sir John Ramsden's estate, instead of another, and that it had received the approval of a Committee of the House of Lords, and also of the Judges of the land, he asked the House not to accept the proposal of his hon. Friend, but to read the Bill a third time.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, the point was simply this. The House was asked to agree to the settlement of land contrary to the view entertained last year, when the Standing Order was passed at the instance of his hon. Friend the Member for Salford (Mr. Arthur Arnold). It was, no doubt, the fact that the House some years ago allowed the trustees of Sir John Ramsden's estates to buy a certain amount of land in Yorkshire, with a view of bringing it into settlement; but that was before the House had fully considered the matter, and before the Standing Order on the subject was passed. The House was now asked to give to the trustees of the Ramsden Estates the power of buying land and settling it at Huddersfield. That was a matter altogether different, and he would certainly vote against the proposal.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 48; Noes 25: Majority 23.—(Div. List, No. 272.)

Bill read the third time, and *passed*, without Amendment.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

—o—

CONSOLIDATED FUND (APPROPRIATION) BILL.

(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Holland.*)

THIRD READING.

Order for Third Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."

EGYPT (FINANCE, &c.)—POLICY OF HER MAJESTY'S GOVERNMENT.

MR. LABOUCHERE, in moving—

> "That this Bill should not be proceeded with until the Government has explained to the House the policy of the Government with regard to Egypt, and the condition under which the recent guaranteed loan was issued."

said, that although he had not been a very staunch supporter of the late Government with regard to their Egyptian policy he had a general confidence in their administration of affairs, and thought it would compare favourably with that of the present Government. The views of the late Government in respect to Egypt were set forth in *The*

Fortnightly Review, he thought in the year 1878, by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Mid Lothian (Mr. Gladstone), and they practically amounted to this—that we should have nothing to do with Egypt. The House had since then been perpetually told that the Egyptian policy of the late Government was one of evacuation, that they were to leave Egypt as soon as possible, but there had always arisen something to prevent their leaving. At one time it was the rising under Arabi, at another it was some particular business in the Soudan, and so on; but the practical outcome of it all was that at the end of four years they were still in Egypt and had a larger army there than when the late Government took Office. There were two pleas put forward for that. The first was that the previous Government had entered into pledges to support the Khedive on the Throne; but he did not think they were bound to support Tewfik against the will of his own subjects. The second plea was that, being in Egypt, they ought to establish a sound Administration there and do something for the Egyptians. Now, it would, he believed, be admitted that the Administration of Egypt was not a whit better than when they went there; it was as rotten and corrupt as ever it was. All that they could say was that they had in some way improved the prisons—that they had, in fact, whitewashed the prisons; but that was hardly a sufficient reason for interfering with the rights of the Egyptians to rule themselves and to establish the form of Government which they preferred. They talked of having set up a Representative Assembly in Egypt; but he was unable to discover whether there really was any such body at all. Certainly the Chamber of Notables seemed not to do anything, nor was its advice ever asked for. There now existed in Egypt a special Oriental despotism tempered by a number of European officials, who did good if they could to Egypt, but who certainly did good to themselves by taking large salaries. Just before they resigned Office, the late Government entered into a Convention with the European Powers for guaranteeing a loan of £9,000,000 to enable Egypt to pay the bondholders and loan-mongers. He did not see why we should give a guarantee in order that the loan-mongers should not suffer. The present Government, however, when they took Office, found that the Convention had been concluded, and no doubt the situation was a difficult one for them. They had determined to send out to Egypt the right hon. Member for Portsmouth (Sir H. Drummond Wolff). A Notice of Motion objecting to that proceeding had been given by an hon. Member. If that Motion had been made, he himself should not have voted for it. The Government had a perfect right to send out someone to see what was going on in Egypt and to give them advice; and he did not think they could have chosen a better man than the right hon. Member for Portsmouth, who had been brought up in the Diplomatic Service, and had distinguished himself in various ways in it. The right hon. Gentleman had acted in Bulgaria with great independence of judgment and not as a Party man, and was as good a man as could be sent out. But before Parliament broke up, the House ought to know what the intentions of the Government were with regard to his Mission, and what were his instructions. Was the right hon. Member for Portsmouth going to give advice to Her Majesty's Government, and to tell them what their policy in respect to Egypt ought to be; or was he going to carry out any policy for them? For himself, he desired that the situation should not be compromised in any way, and that no fresh pledges should be entered into until the new Parliament met. He did not anticipate that they would withdraw from Egypt before the next Parliament assembled; but the House ought to have some assurance that the intention was to withdraw, to put Egypt under some sort of European guarantee, and to neutralize the country. That appeared to have been the intention of the late Government, although their intentions might have been carried out in rather an extraordinary way. Another point to which he wished to refer was the issue of the loan. A few days ago he had asked the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House whether, on assuming Office, he had learnt that it was the intention of the late Government to bring the loan out by tender. The right hon. Gentleman replied that that was the intention of the late Government, but that the present Government had altered that and had brought it out at a specific price.

He supposed the reason of that alteration was that Prince Bismarck objected to the loan being brought out by tender, and he did not deny that there were, perhaps, reasons why the Government should yield on that point. It was stated in the Correspondence that Lord Rothschild informed the Government that applications by tender for loans were not known on the Continent. He thought he had a right to ask why the price at which the loan was issued was so low? He did not blame Lord Rothschild in the least; he was perfectly right to make as good a bargain as he could; but it was somewhat curious that it appeared from the Correspondence that Lord Rothschild and Mr. Daniell, who, they were told, were consulted as to the price, came to the conclusion that $95\frac{1}{2}$ was the price at which the loan should be issued. Why was that not done? Why was it afterwards brought out at $94\frac{3}{4}$? When the loan was brought out, it immediately went to 3 premium, and on a loan of £9,000,000 that meant no less a sum than £270,000. It was clear that if a loan brought out at $94\frac{3}{4}$, with the guarantee of the English Government, at once went to 3 premium, in the opinion of investors and bankers it was brought out too low. The House, therefore, had a right to complain that this money was taken from the Egyptians and given to other persons. A portion of it went to Germany and France, and a portion—a much larger portion—of it was distributed in the City of London. The profit on the issue of the loan was large and immediate, and the House ought to know into whose pocket it went. They all knew the City of London was a thorough Conservative nest, and it appeared to him that one of the objects of bringing out the loan so low was not only that Prince Bismarck and his banker, Mr. Bleichröeder, might have their share of the plunder, but also that the Conservative nest in the City of London might have their share. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that Lord Rothschild only received £500 per £1,000,000 as commission for negotiating the loan. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: And reasonable incidental expenses.] He had at once asked the right hon. Gentleman whether brokerage was included in that sum, and it turned out that there was a brokerage, besides incidental expenses, of $\frac{1}{4}$ per cent, or £22,000 on the whole loan. The house of Rothschilds gave $\frac{1}{8}$ per cent brokerage to any broker who obtained applications from his clients; and he could not understand on what grounds a broker, simply for sending in applications from his client, was to receive $\frac{1}{8}$ per cent, unless it was felt that no loan could be brought out in this country when a Conservative Government was in power without giving the Stock Exchange some little sop in order to keep them sweet for the elections. No wonder, under all the circumstances, this loan, as announced by the Conservative organs, was a great success. The origin and source of our trouble in Egypt was loan-mongering, which had now reached a state of things which, in his opinion, constituted a public scandal. He contended that the Government was bound in honour to do for Egypt precisely as they would have done for any other Dependency. What would be said in India if a loan were brought out in this country for India 3 or 4 per cent below the price of Consols, and the market price immediately went up to Consols, all the premiums being distributed among a large number of City people? Any Government would be denounced if they did such a thing; but, simply because the cost was thrown on the wretched fellahs of Egypt, it was considered reasonable that City gentlemen should get as much out of them as they could. The hon. Gentleman concluded by moving the Resolution of which he had given Notice.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "this Bill should not be proceeded with until the Government has explained to the House the policy of the Government with regard to Egypt, and the conditions under which the recent guaranteed loan was issued,"—(*Mr. Labouchere,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he agreed with the observations of the hon. Member for Northampton with regard to the Egyptian Loan, and hoped that some explanation would be forthcoming from the Chancellor of the Exchequer. When people in England first heard of the Mission of Sir Henry Wolff to Egypt they said—"Good heavens! how can the Government want more information?" But he must say that, under the present circumstances, he was inclined to agreed with his hon. Friend that they could not denounce the Government for sending out a man like Sir Henry Wolff to get more information, for hon. Members had for some time been astounded at replies given to their Questions about Egyptian affairs. The Foreign Office, indeed, seemed at the present time to be a blank in regard to what was going on in Egypt. He had asked the Under Secretary as to the autonomous institutions of Egypt, and as to whether, in regard to the loan, the requirements of the Egyptian law had been complied with, whether the Legislative Council had been called together as required, and as to whether the elected Members had really been elected according to law; and the answer of the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs was that he knew nothing about these matters. The hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. Villiers Stuart) inquired whether the abuses with which the late Government promised to deal were still in existence; and the reply was that the Foreign Office had no information whatever on the subject. This was astounding. What were we paying our agents in Egypt £5,000 or £6,000 a-year for if they gave the Foreign Office no information on such important points as these? He hoped that the Government would insist on obtaining substantial information with regard to what was going on in Egypt. It was certainly very desirable that before the House separated Her Majesty's Government should give some inkling of what their policy in Egypt was to be. He admitted that a fully developed policy in all its details could not at the present moment be expected. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had explained that Sir Henry Wolff was not going direct to Egypt, but would proceed first to Constantinople; and he added that Sir Henry Wolff's object in going to Constantinople had something to do with the defence of Egypt. It seemed as if Her Majesty's Government had some idea of calling in the aid of the Sultan for the defence of Egypt. That seemed to be an intelligible policy; whether it was a practicable one might be open to doubt. If that was the policy of the Government, he hoped they would take care that it was carried out in a way which would not work evil. The situation was really so bad that it could not be worse; it was a situation injurious to the country; and he, for one, would welcome almost any plan that would extricate us from our difficulties. Long ago, when we first went to Egypt, he had said that the effect of our going there would be that we should be the best-hated people in Europe by the Egyptians. And that had come to pass. We had piled up loan on loan, and had made no substantial reforms for the benefit of the country. He should be prepared to entertain even the plan of bringing in the Turks, though the moral sense of Europe would revolt against that being done without adequate safeguards for the autonomous institutions of Egypt. He did not object to the Turks as a people; he thought the Turks were an excellent people, and none the worse for being Mahomedans; but the Turkish Government was execrable. If autonomous institutions were given to the Turkish Provinces, it might be possible to give similar institutions to Egypt, and make that country an effective part of the Turkish Empire, employing Turkish troops for the defence of Egypt. But before anything was done in the direction of calling in the Turk the autonomous institutions of Egypt must be made a reality, so that Turkey might not be able to treat Egypt as it had treated Turkish Provinces hitherto. He hoped that Her Majesty's Government would not adopt the nonsensical view of the Sultan's power as Caliph and head of the Mahomedan religion throughout the world. It might as well be said that the Emperor of Russia was the head of the Christian religion. The present Sultan was inclined to exaggerate his semi-religious personal power, and this was the worst feature of the present Turkish Government. If Her Majesty's Government resolved to make use of the Sultan in Egypt, he should be treated, not as Caliph, but as head of a great political State and of a fine people. The condition of things in Egypt was so bad that almost any change must be for the better. He would not condemn by anticipation anything Her Majesty's Government might do; he believed they were desirous to do their best; they had succeeded to a most arduous task, and he, for one, wished them well.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON said, that this was probably the last opportunity they would have of discussing these Egyptian matters; and as this year would be known as the £100,000,000 Budget year, it was due to the House and the country that it should be fully considered whether the Expenditure had been for the benefit of the people of this country or of any other country. The great bulk of the additional Expenditure had been incurred for slaughter in different parts of the world, or in preparations for slaughter. Some of the Members of the present Parliament would feel that they could not look back upon its proceedings with any great satisfaction. When the Liberal Party came into power it was understood that one of its great doctrines was that henceforth we were to respect the rights of nations, and that the weak nations were to be put on the same footing as the strong. Yet never had so many annexations been made as during the last five years, nor had there ever been a series of more unjust, wicked, cruel, contemptible wars. Whatever might have been the domestic policy of the late Government, their foreign policy seemed to have been nothing less than odious and revolting.

Mr. SPEAKER said, he must recall attention to the fact that there was a specific Amendment before the House, which dealt exclusively with the policy of the Government in Egypt and the conditions of the loan. The remarks of the hon. Member were more appropriate to the general question of the third reading of the Bill.

Sir WILFRID LAWSON said, he was obliged to the Speaker for calling him back to the right path; but he objected to the whole policy that had given rise to the loan. What was the object of that policy? He supposed it was to uphold the Government of one of the most contemptible despots who had ever appeared even in the East. We had brought all this evil upon ourselves by preventing people abroad from making efforts to be as free as we were. If the people of this country desired such a policy, he did not at all object to their paying £100,000,000 or £200,000,000 a-year for it. He trusted the present Government would not follow in the steps of their Predecessors. He would not say that he hoped they would not do worse, because that would be impossible; but he hoped they would not be equally bad. In his opinion the Government ought, before the House broke up, to state what was the object of the Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff. It was said that he was going to confer with the Sultan. Well, no good could come of that, or of any intrigue to prop up his power. Then Sir H. Drummond Wolff was going to the Khedive. That was to go from bad to worse; and he could not have two worse counsellors. If Sir H. Drummond Wolff went out with a definite purpose to do good to the people of Egypt his Mission would not be objected to. Arabi was the man who had the support of public opinion in Egypt, and by his restoration we should do more good to Egypt than had been done by all the battles, and loans, and manœuvres of the last few years.

Sir JOHN HAY said, he would like to know whether it was the intention of the Government that some portion of the £4,000,000 of the loan that was to be of immediate application would be given to those who had suffered from the cruel burning of Alexandria? It must be remembered that the destruction of life and property in Alexandria was due to the fact that the late Government neglected to land troops immediately after the bombardment. No time should be lost in re-imbursing those unfortunate persons who had been ruined by the action of the Government.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he wished to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether Messrs. Rothschild might not be able to obtain the £1,200,000 they had advanced out of the loan at the price of issue instead of in cash? because, if that was the case, they would be able to make a clear profit of £45,000, besides any previous commission.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Of course, it is not at all my intention to go back upon the question which was partly raised by the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson), although I think I may express, on behalf of the Government, my thanks to the hon. Baronet for the anticipation he has formed that our action in Egypt will not be worse than that of the Government he has supported. [Sir Wilfrid Lawson: It cannot be worse.] It would not be at all desirable that we should on this occasion enter into any discussion of the past in Egypt. What I think the House has a fair right to ask for is some general statement such as I am about to make of our views with regard to the future, and especially with regard to the Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff, and some explanation of the circumstances of the issue of the Egyptian Loan. With regard to the Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff, I was glad to hear the expressions of satisfaction, so far as the personal nature of that appointment is concerned, which have fallen from several hon. Members. I may venture to say, on behalf of the Government, I think there is no one in the country to whom we could look with greater hope for good service in this matter, having regard to the diplomatic abilities which he has displayed, to the experience he possesses, and to the great success which he has achieved in a similar undertaking in Eastern Roumelia. The House will recollect the duty which he undertook in that Province; and anyone who has followed its history will be able to realize how well Sir H. Drummond Wolff performed a very difficult and delicate task, and what great benefits he conferred upon the inhabitants of that country. We may look with great hope, indeed, to the services which my right hon. Friend may be able to render in negotiations with other Powers which are not less concerned than we are in the welfare of Egypt. Sir H. Drummond Wolff will be accredited as a Special Envoy to the Sultan. I hope the House will recognize what I and other Members of Her Majesty's Government have frequently stated in the past—that we fully admit, in the first place, that we have certain obligations with reference to Egypt, which have been increasing almost weekly with every step which has been taken by this country during the past five years in that part of the world, and which entail upon us duties that cannot be neglected in the way the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) would wish them to be. Well, in the second place, we also recognize the fact that we do not stand alone in Egypt, but that other Powers besides ourselves have rights and interests there, and that it is not only our duty, but an absolute necessity, for us to endeavour to act in concert with them. Now, there is one Power which has especial rights there—that is, the Porte, which is recognized by the Treaty of Paris, in which all the European Powers concurred, as having sovereign rights over Egypt. Therefore it is that we think it essential to do what we can to secure that which I am afraid has been rather neglected in the past, the goodwill of the Porte in dealing with these affairs. Sir H. Drummond Wolff will, therefore, in the first place, go to Constantinople, and, being accredited as our Special Envoy in matters of this importance and delicacy, it is not in my power to state to the House the precise instructions with which he will be provided. But I may venture to say that the object of Sir H. Drummond Wolff's Mission and of our policy in Egypt is this—to put the Egyptian Government upon a footing, with respect to the external defence of the country, to its finance, and to its internal administration, such as will gradually give security and freedom to its independent action in the future. That is a policy which I hope may recommend itself to this House. I will say nothing about the evacuation of Egypt. I think nothing could be more fatal to the success of our endeavours than to make any promises or references of that kind. We have a great task to perform, and we must endeavour, acting in the spirit I have described, to do that duty to the best of our power. Let me say one word as to the defence of Egypt. The House will, I think, be of opinion that nothing more unsatisfactory than the present conditions under which we have undertaken the defence of part of the Sultan's Dominions in that part of the world—namely, the port of Suakin, can well be conceived. Is it possible for us to enter into any arrangement with the Turkish Power by which, retaining to ourselves all necessary control, we may make such arrangements for the future as may be eventually more satisfactory to the country, and, at the same time, more in accordance with the rights of the Sovereign of that part of the world than those which exist at present? I throw that out as one of the points with which Sir Drummond Wolff will have to deal. Then with regard to matters of internal administration, in which, as we know, the hon. Member for Waterford has taken a great and philanthropic interest. We are as anxious as our Predecessors were to reform the internal administration of Egypt, and to make such changes as may be conducive to the real interests of the country. But we feel that this must be a work of time, and can only be done gradually, though I think it might be done rather more quickly than the progress already made would seem to indicate. The only way in which any progress can be made in this important work is to make it thoroughly well known to the world that we intend to remain in Egypt in order to perform it, and not to talk about immediate or early evacuation. Now, Sir, I think it will be admitted by all who have studied this question that the financial condition of Egypt is the key to the whole situation. How shall we deal with that matter? When we came into Office we found this country bound by the Convention which was practically ratified by the House in the Spring. That Convention provided for a loan of £9,000,000, to be raised on the security of an International Guarantee, for the present settlement, at any rate, of the finances of Egypt. That Convention was an inheritance from our Predecessors. We expressed our opinion as to the policy of it freely at the time. I do not wish to go back to past debates; but I see no reason to recede from the position we then took up. But when we assumed Office it had been accepted by Parliament, and this country was bound by it, and our duty was to do our best to carry it out. What was the position in which we found this matter? We found that, although the Act authorizing the English guarantee was passed in the early Spring, weeks and even months had passed, and no practical step had been taken towards issuing the loan. That was a serious state of affairs. The Government of Egypt was stated by the late Prime Minister, when pressing this Convention upon the consideration of the House, to be in the most imminent danger of bankruptcy. Before Easter we were even refused a few days' delay for the proper consideration of the subject on account of the imminence of that danger. The Egyptian Government was only saved from bankruptcy by monthly advances of a few hundred thousands made by Messrs. Rothschild on no legal security whatever, but simply on the faith of a private note from the late Foreign Secretary. That was not all. The provisions of the Convention for taxing the Coupons and suspending the Sinking Fund could not be carried out so long as the loan was not issued. The indemnities to which my right hon. Friend referred could not be paid. There was great distress suffered by those to whom these indemnities were owing, and constant pressure was being brought to bear on the Egyptian Government in order that these indemnities should be paid. I do not think anyone can doubt that the greatest dangers and difficulties must have occurred if the issue of this loan had been longer delayed. Why was it delayed so long? I am sorry that hon. Members are hardly yet in possession of the Correspondence issued by the Foreign Office on this subject. But they will find in No. 81 a despatch from Lord Granville to Sir Edward Malet, dated the 14th May, which shows the last offer made by Her Majesty's late Government to the German Government with reference to the issue of the loan. The question had arisen as to the mode in which the loan should be issued—whether it should be issued, as was probably originally intended, only in London, or whether it should not also be issued in Berlin and Paris; and this is the last proposal made to the German Government on the subject—

"I have to inform you that Her Majesty's Government are anxious to meet the wishes of Prince Bismarck, as far as possible, regarding the mode of issue of the new Egyptian Loan, and are prepared to propose the following plan to the guaranteeing Powers:—(1.) To offer the whole loan to be tendered for simultaneously in Paris, Berlin, and London in pounds sterling, it being notified that the highest tenders, wherever they may be made, would be accepted to the extent of the required amount, not exceeding £9,000,000. (2.) The tenders to be accompanied by a deposit, which would either be returned in the event of the tender not being accepted, or retained in part payment of the first instalment. (3.) The tenders to be opened simultaneously at the three capitals, and the list of the applications received at Paris and Berlin would be sent by the banks at those places authorized to receive tenders to the Bank of England, the London list being similarly sent to the Paris and Berlin bankers; the Bank of England then to allot the loan to the highest tenderers irrespective of nationality, or the city at which the tenders were received. (4.) The Governments of France and Germany to indicate without delay the bank at which they would wish that tenders should be received (one at each capital), and the Bank of England to be instructed to communicate with them as to details. I have to request your Excellency to submit this plan to Prince Bismarck, unofficially, in the first place, for his concurrence. In the event of his accepting it, Her Majesty's Government will communicate it officially to all the Powers."

I quite agree with the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) that it would have been an advantage to the Egyptian Government if this loan could have been issued by tender rather than at a fixed price; and had it been possible for the loan to have been issued in the London market alone under such conditions as the late Government suggested to the German Government, undoubtedly the issue ought to have been by tender. But what was the reply of the German Government to that proposition? It is contained in No. 98 of the Papers just issued, and is a despatch, dated May 27, from Sir Edward Malet to Earl Granville—

"Count Hatzfeldt spoke to me yesterday on the subject of the proposal with regard to the mode of issue of the new Egyptian Loan contained in your Lordship's despatch of the 14th instant. He said that Prince Bismarck had taken advice on the matter, and that it appeared that the method proposed of offering the loan for tender was one unknown in Germany, and the result would not be that which he desired —that is to say, that a portion of the loan should be subscribed for in Germany. The Chancellor was anxious on the subject, because he believed that the Reichstag would not authorize the guarantee of the loan unless Germany had the opportunity of taking part in the subscription, and the proposal which he had put forward was made in the interest of the Convention. Count Hatzfeldt remarked that your Lordship's offer in no way met the wish that Berlin should be added to Paris and London for the payment of the coupon, or that a share of the loan should be issued at Berlin. Count Hatzfeldt added that it would be useless to present the matter to the Reichstag in its present form, and that the Chancellor was only seeking a means to make it acceptable."

What did that reply really amount to? When the Convention had been agreed to by the Powers, to all appearances Germany was unwilling to be bound by it, and desired to re-open the whole question. What were we to do? We were face to face with the great dangers to which I have alluded. We felt that it was absolutely necessary that the loan should be issued at the earliest moment, and therefore we proposed to the other Powers that it should be issued at a fixed price in London, Paris, and Berlin, in anticipation of ratification by the Parliaments which had not ratified it, and that a statement should be made on behalf of those Powers whose Parliaments had not ratified it that the measure for procuring its ratification should be submitted to them on their re-assembling at the earliest possible moment. That proposition was accepted and the loan was issued. I do not think I need dwell, after what I have read to the House, upon the suggestion of the hon. Member for Northampton, that the loan should have been issued by tender. But the hon. Member also found fault with the price fixed for the issue of the loan. Of course, it is a very difficult matter indeed to settle the price of issue of a loan of this character. Any rumour of foreign difficulties might have momentarily disturbed the market, and led to the loan being received in a manner very different from the manner in which it was received. What appeared to us of great importance was that there should be no risk of the loan being a failure. It was not only all-important to meet the financial difficulties to which I have referred, but also to re-establish credit and freedom of enterprize in Egypt itself. Therefore we preferred to err, perhaps, on the safe side, rather than run the risk of failure. I do not hesitate to say that if circumstances had permitted emission by tender a higher price might have been obtained by the Egyptian Government. But I do not think we should have been justified, after consulting the high authorities named in these Papers, in fixing a higher price than 95½. It must be remembered that this loan is really depreciated rather than increased in value by the foreign guarantee. It cannot be considered in the same light as the English Funds or the Stocks of the Metropolitan Board of Works. It is a loan of small amount. It is a loan in which, being issued in bonds payable to bearer, trustees cannot invest; and all these circumstances together make it unreasonable to expect that it would command the same price in the market as our own funds. The hon. Member for Northampton has made some allusions to the gain which he seems to suppose Messrs. Rothschild may derive from the issue of this loan. Of course, reasonable profits must be made by a house which undertakes the issue of a loan involving, no doubt, some risk to themselves. [Mr. LABOUCHERE: What risk?] Surely the issue of a loan does involve some risk. The Egyptian Loan was entrusted to Messrs. Rothschild on commission on the same terms as it would have been entrusted to the Bank of England. It was impossible for them to repay the advance of £1,300,000 which they had made to the Egyptian Government by taking an equivalent amount of Stock firm at 95½, as by the terms of the Convention of March 18 the first proceeds of the loan were to be devoted to the payment of the Alexandria indemnities; nor was there ever any suggestion of such an arrangement. Then the hon. Member suggested that the Messrs. Rothschild might make money by reserving a large part of this loan for themselves; but the applications for that portion of the loan reserved by agreement for the London market were on such a scale that, in order to make an allotment to the public on principles similar to those which Messrs. Rothschild have always adopted, and which, so far as I know, have given general satisfaction, they will be absolutely unable to retain any large amount of the loan, if any at all.

Mr. LABOUCHERE asked whether Messrs. Rothschild had a right to retain their advances out of the loan at the price of 95?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No; they could not. Four millions were to go to the payment of these indemnities. I really do not wish to trouble the House with the different details; but we found it to be necessary, in the circumstances I have stated to the House, that this loan should be issued by a house closely allied with the two foreign capitals in which two-thirds of the loan were to be raised. We made arrangements with that house to issue this loan on the terms stated in the Papers. We made the best arrangements in our power with the best advice at our command. It may very likely be that, both with regard to the price of the loan and the sum paid for the issue of the loan, Egypt may be worse off than if we had had a perfectly free hand in the matter. But, bound as we were by the adoption of the principle of an International Guarantee to agree that the Foreign Powers should have a share of the loan, we were obliged to adopt the only arrangement by which this could have been carried into effect. The loan would not have been issued if we had merely adhered to the position taken up by our Predecessors, and the result would have been, eventually, a greater loss to Egypt than anything which can possibly occur from the arrangements which we have made. I must apologize to the House for the length of my statement. I have endeavoured to explain the reasons for our financial action. All I would add is this —that in our policy for the future we shall be guided by the principles which I have stated, in the hope that before long we may effect some real and important improvement in Egypt, now that this financial question has at last been settled to the benefit not only of the creditors of Egypt, to whom the hon. Member alluded, but, what is of infinitely greater importance, to the advantage of the inhabitants of the country.

Mr. VILLIERS STUART said, he thought the Government had obtained exceedingly good terms in the matter of the loan. Three weeks ago British Consols had touched 94½, another war scare would send them down to the same figure again. The contractors, therefore, in bringing them out, the Guaranteed Loan at 95 had incurred a real risk; and we, in the present position of foreign affairs, had really obtained a better bargain than could have been expected. Turning to the general question of Egypt, he could observe that this was now a dying Parliament; it was upon its death-bed, and he thought it was appropriate that in its last hours its conscience should be haunted by at least one ghost, one subject of bitter remorse, and that was the fate of Egypt. How splendid had been the opportunity we obtained there three years ago by the battle of Tel-el-Kebir! It was in our power to secure the most commanding position in the world from a political and military and a commercial point of view, a position coveted by some of the greatest nations ancient and modern. It was in our power to show to the world the spectacle of good government, liberty, and prosperity conferred by us upon a country which had been misgoverned, ground down, and plundered for ages. Such a result would have justified our interference there and vindicated our character before the whole civilized world as the champions of liberty, enlightenment, and progress. Instead of that we had bound additional burdens upon the Egyptian people, and their last state was worse than their first. He had not the heart to paint the picture of the actual condition to which we had reduced that unhappy country within three short years. As he had said, this Parliament was on its death-bed. It could not undo the past, but it could insist upon pledges as to the future—pledges from the present Government that they would do their very utmost to make what amends remained possible, and to use their power to reform abuses and establish good government. It was not even now too late. We had been constantly told that the bankrupt condition of Egypt was the reason why certain important reforms could not be proceeded with. That obstacle was now removed, and he had hoped that now at last existing abuses would be redressed; but he was bitterly disappointed at the reply to his Question on Monday. He had hoped that advantage would have been taken of it to declare an earnest intention on the part of the Government to grapple with the Egyptian difficulty with the steadfast purpose of solving it. It was due to this Parliament, if Her Majesty's Government had such a purpose, to give it the consolation of this parting assurance; but they had had instead a reply of which no one could make head or tail. The right hon. Gentlemen who now occupied the Treasury Bench had again and again, while in Opposition, twitted the late Administration with concealing their purpose; but their utterances on the subject of Egypt were luminous as compared with those to which we were now treated. We were told that no Papers had been found in the Foreign Office bearing upon the abuses which it had been our business to remedy, and which the honour and good name of England were concerned in reforming. There existed, at all events, the able Report of Lord Dufferin on those abuses, and suggestions for their remedy. Last Session he questioned the noble Lord the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs as to whether any step had been taken to deal with the abuses of the forced labour system, and was told in reply that reform of those abuses must wait till the financial difficulty was removed. Well, now it was removed; but on appealing for information as to the intentions of the present Cabinet on that and similar subjects they were mocked with vain words. It would be impossible to travel over the whole field of misgovernment and mismanagement of the resources of Egypt; but he would like to point out with regard to that particular one of forced labour that it was not a mere question of the personal sufferings of the victims. It affected the productiveness and prosperity of all Egypt. The cruel waste of life and labour involved in requiring the victims to work without tools, or food, or shelter was a loss, and a very serious loss, to the country. With tools and food the work could be done by one-fourth the number of men, and the remaining three-fourths could be left to attend to their farms. No one who had not personally visited the farms of those Fellaheen who were absent on forced labour duty could have any idea of the loss in production caused by compulsory neglect of irrigation. The yellow blasted look of the crops spoke for themselves. But he must not take up the time of the House, and he could do no more than glance at this one item of misgovernment. But he appealed most earnestly to Her Majesty's Ministers to give now the assurance which they evaded giving the other day. If they did not intend to establish good government in Egypt, then it would be better to withdraw; but if we were now to march out of Egypt and leave it in its present lamentable condition we should deserve the scorn and contempt of the whole civilized world.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: I have no desire to speak at any length upon the subjects that have been brought forward in this debate, or to criticize in detail the statements of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I will only say of the statements that have been made by the hon. Baronet the Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) and by the hon. Baronet the Member for Carlisle (Sir Wilfrid Lawson), although they are very severe as a criticism of the late Government, yet they are of so vague and indefinite a character that it would be simply a waste of the time of the House to go into them. It is said that the condition of Egypt could not be worse. That is a statement which it is extremely easy to make, but it is not substantiated by any detailed argument. It may be admitted that the condition of Egypt is not so satisfactory as could be wished in many respects; but I absolutely deny it is so bad that it could not be worse under any circumstances. It might, on the contrary, be a great deal worse. What is the condition of Egypt? I am not aware that the position of Europeans in Egypt is in the slightest degree insecure; their property is safe, and they are pursuing their trades and avocations in safety. Their condition might be much less secure, and they might be far less certain of reaping the fruits of their industry. As to the condition of the people of Egypt, I cannot admit the contentions of my hon. Friends. Do hon. Members suppose there is heavier taxation or more misgovernment than before? Some hon. Members may assume that Arabi was an Egyptian patriot, possessing the confidence of the Egyptian people, and animated by nothing but the highest and most patriotic motives. It is quite competent to them to hold that opinion, and to believe that if we had allowed Arabi to become master of Egypt a better state of things would have been established. But in the opinion of the late Government he was nothing but a military adventurer, and his dominion would have meant insecurity for the life and property of Europeans and of Natives in Egypt. I say that if Arabi had been allowed to pursue his career unchecked a condition of things might have been brought about which would have been infinitely worse than anything which can be said of Egypt now. It is useless to attempt to discuss in detail charges of such a vague character which no attempt is made to substantiate in detail. I have no desire to follow in detail the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer. I have no complaint to make of the general statement of policy which he has made with regard to Egypt. I will only say that this statement does not appear to me to be much more precise, or to convey much more information to the House or to the country, than those statements of policy of the late Government which were so frequently and so severely criticized on this side of the House as wanting in accuracy, precision, and definitiveness. I notice that the right hon. Gentleman has said that the present Government recognize that we have incurred great obligations in Egypt. He also admits that other Powers have responsibilities and rights in Egypt. These are statements which have been frequently made by the late Government; but they were found to be extremely unsatisfactory, and wanting in precision. I do not know in what respect the right hon. Gentleman or any Member of the present Government has in the slightest degree assumed a more definite attitude than the attitude for which the late Government was so much attacked and complained of. I have no objection to the Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff, provided its character and scope are accurately understood and defined. I agree with all that has been said as to his personal fitness. I believe he has great knowledge of Eastern politics, and the result of his former Mission to Eastern Roumelia was greatly to the credit of the right hon. Gentleman. But I would remind the House that with regard to Egyptian politics Sir H. Drummond Wolff occupies a somewhat peculiar position. He is not only a person possessing great information, but he is also known as a Member of this House who has taken a definite and strong line in regard to Egyptian policy. He has made attacks somewhat exceeding the usual licence of debate, and he has associated himself with those who have not only attacked the policy of the present Khedive, but have also brought severe and grave charges against him. The right hon. Gentleman says that Sir H. Drummond Wolff is going to inquire and report and to advise Her Majesty's Government in their endeavour to bring about a more satisfactory state of things in regard to both the external defence and the internal administration of Egypt. But an important part of the internal administration is the position of the Khedive himself. It is not desirable to have it supposed that Sir H. Drummond Wolff has been selected for this Mission on account of the attitude he has taken up towards the Khedive. [The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: That is not so.] I am glad the right hon. Gentleman says it is not so; but I think the House will see that something more than silence on this matter is required. Sir H. Drummond Wolff is known in former times to have been a very bitter enemy and a personal opponent of the administration of the Khedive. The Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff, without an explanation of his present position, is calculated to give rise to that which has always been one source of the difficulty of administration in Egypt—namely, political intrigue. There are intrigues in Constantinople, where he is going, and in Egypt, and in other parts of the East, the object of which is to upset the Khedive and to bring about some other form of government. The Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff, without explanation, is calculated, in my opinion, to give encouragement and assistance to all those persons who desire, for personal reasons, to upset the Government of the present Khedive. I believe Lord Salisbury has stated in "another place" the intention of the Government to support the Khedive as he has been supported by us. It would have been desirable, on the present occasion, when the right hon. Gentleman undertook to give us an outline of the character of the Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff, when he stated that that Mission had relation to the internal administration of Egypt, that he should have said it was no part of the intention of Her Majesty's Government to upset the Government existing in Egypt, or to take any action against it. It is not for me now to defend the Khedive; it may be that events have taken place under his Government which have weakened the position he occupies and have rendered him an unstable Governor. I do not say that, in my opinion, that is the case; but, if it was, it would be the duty of the Government to make up their minds on the subject, and openly to announce to the Khedive and to Europe that his Government was no longer a stable one, and there was no reason why it should be any longer supported. If that is not the case; if it is the opinion of the Government that, in present circumstances, no better Ruler than the Khedive can be found, if it is their opinion we are bound to him by honourable obligations, it seems to me they should have availed themselves of this opportunity to show that the Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff has no relation whatever to those former opinions which he has expressed respecting the Khedive, and that it is not their intention to countenance or give support to any underhand intrigues against the Government of Egypt. I will not enter into any discussion upon the subject of the loan. The Government have been in this matter guided by the best motives. It may be that in other circumstances better terms might have been obtained for the Egyptian Government; but I believe that we, in this House, have the most perfect and implicit confidence that questions of stock-jobbing, or of undue favour to any individual, never enter into transactions of this kind, to whatever Party the Government may belong. It is possible that in other circumstances better terms might have been obtained; but I have not the slightest doubt that the Government have done the best they could, and that nothing has been further from their intention than to favour any party whatever.

MR. W. E. FORSTER said, he thought the explanation which had been asked by the noble Lord with reference to the Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff was one which the Government ought to give, and which he could not but suppose they would be glad of the opportunity of giving. He did not wish to go into the past. The resources of bad government in Oriental countries were very great, and it was possible things might have been worse. But there was one matter in which this country felt great interest, and it would be difficult for its position to be worse. He referred to the question of slavery and the Slave Trade. Undoubtedly what had happened in the Soudan had caused a great number of slaves to be taken, and the slave market had been glutted by prisoners captured from the tribes which had been friendly to us. In addition to that there was every reason to believe, and he believed the Foreign Office were in possession of proof of the fact, that the Slave Trade and slavery were connived at by men of high position in Egypt itself. He could not give proofs of this, because, as the right hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs was well aware, it would be impossible to produce the proof publicly without greatly endangering those who had furnished it. He did not, however, doubt that Her Majesty's Government would, through their Special Commissioner, see that this matter was carefully looked into. What the Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated as to the earnestness of the Government to secure that the influence of this country in Egypt should have some good effect and that reforms should be undertaken was, on the whole, satisfactory. The reason why he thought it satisfactory was that the present Government seemed to be aware that it was of no use pressing for reforms and immediately afterwards, or at the same time, saying that they intended to get out of Egypt. What did reforms mean, especially in Oriental countries? They must mean very considerable personal inconvenience, if not injury, to those who had thriven on abuses, and they would get no one to effect reforms and carry them out in anything like an effective or honest manner if he was under the belief that in a year or two he would be left to the mercy and revenge of those whom he had enraged by preventing them carrying on abuses. It seemed to him that it was utterly impossible that they could expect to get reforms on such conditions as these. Therefore he was glad to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer state that the Government considered that if they were to do any good in Egypt there must be a clear understanding that they would see it actually done before they left. The Chancellor of the Exchequer also spoke of negotiations with the Turkish Government with regard to Suakin. The difficulties there were no doubt immense. No one denied that; but he did trust that we should not add to our other disasters in Egypt the disaster of replacing the country, either Suakin or Egypt itself, under Turkish rule. He did hope there was no such intention as that, for he believed that it would be better for us to clear out of the Soudan altogether than to introduce under our sanction and responsibility the Turks as governors. He did not deny that the question was beset with difficulties; but he hoped the House would excuse him for having stated from his present knowledge what really appeared to be true.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS (Mr. BOURKE) said, the noble Lord opposite had expressed surprise at the fact that his right hon. Friend the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made no definite statement with regard to the support of the Khedive. The only reason why his right hon. Friend made no such statement was that he thought it was entirely unnecessary. The most definite assurances had been given by his noble Friend Lord Salisbury with regard to the support which it was the intention of the Government to give to the Khedive. There was no intention whatever on the part of the Government to withhold that support from the Khedive which he had always had from the British Government. There was one remark which he thought he might make with regard to the Mission of his right hon. Friend Sir H. Drummond Wolff, and that was that he was the one person in this Parliament who had from time to time pressed upon the late Government the importance of giving Parliamentary institutions to Egypt, and his desire to do so was recognized by the Prime Minister in the House. All he could say, in addition, was that the Government had every reason to believe that Sir H. Drummond Wolff would be welcomed by the Khedive in the most cordial manner; and with regard to His Majesty the Sultan, he had the highest authority for saying that the Sultan and the Porte were of opinion that the Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff could not but facilitate the bringing about of a better state of things in Egypt, and the Sultan was ready, he believed, to give to his right hon. Friend that welcome which might be expected. He wished now to make one or two remarks with respect to the observations of the hon. Members for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell), and Waterford (Mr. Villiers Stuart). With regard to the remarks of the former, according to the Organic Law of Egypt, there were three Bodies to be brought into existence — namely, Provincial Councils, the Legislative Assembly, and the General Assembly. Of these three Bodies the only one that had come into being was the Legislative Assembly; and the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) contended that it had been illegally constituted, because it was to be partly made up of delegates from the Provincial Councils, which had no existence. All he could say on the subject was that the circumstances which gave rise to the question occurred two years ago, and Her Majesty's present Government were in no way responsible for what took place two years ago. He was told, however, that although the Provinces had not been regularly represented in the Legislative Assembly, yet, at the same time, they had sometimes sent Representatives. There was no information at the Foreign Office on the subject, and therefore he could not go into it further on the present occasion. The hon. Member for Waterford (Mr. Villiers Stuart) seemed to be disappointed with the answer he had given him as to the question of forced labour. He agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster) that these were questions which, no doubt, involved a complete change in the whole system of Egypt; and there was no use in giving expression to the aspirations and hopes of Her Majesty's Government upon them unless they were prepared to do their best to intervene by the suppression of such practices as were now prevalent in that country, and to stand by the persons who might help to put them down. As to the use of the kourbash, the late Government had often been interrogated on the subject, and they said they had reason to believe that its use had very much diminished in Egypt. So long as he himself held his present position, he should endeavour to avoid any answer that would mislead the House. If he had given an answer of the sort he had cited, it might very naturally have been said that the kourbash was not used. He was sorry to say that he could not. He had no doubt that the kourbash was abolished by law in Egypt; and although the late Government were right in saying that it was not used so much, yet he was quite certain that in out-of-the-way Provinces and in places where the present Administration could not reach the kourbash was used. He was not in a position to say that it was possible to abolish its use; they must first find out whether they could do so or not before making a statement to the House with respect to it. Then, as to the Slave Trade, when the present Government were in Office before they made very great strides towards its abolition; but they would have to begin that work all over again, and he had no doubt that the difficulties they would have to contend with now would be far greater than they were at that time; for it had been acknowledged by the late Government and by General Gordon that the abandonment of the Soudan must necessarily give an enormous impetus to the Slave Trade. He had no doubt the late Government took all that into consideration when they advised the abandonment of the Soudan. With regard to the loan, he did not think it necessary to add anything to the explanation given by the Chancellor of the Exchequer; but he might make two observations. The Four per Cent Guaranteed Loan of 1855 was now at £104 per cent, which was equal to £78 per cent for a 3 per cent loan such as that now being issued. The price of £95½ per cent could not, therefore, be deemed inadequate. It would have been perfectly impossible for the loan to have been issued under the conditions proposed, very properly and very justly, by the late Government, for the result would have been that three different scrips of this loan would have been floating about the world, issued at different prices.

MR. M'COAN said, that when he first heard the announcement of the intended Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff he hailed it with hope as the sign of a new departure in our policy towards Egypt. He was well aware not only of the extensive knowledge of Egyptian politics possessed by Sir H. Drummond Wolff, but of his views as to what was a sound and just policy in relation to that country; and he ventured, therefore, to hope that any policy of which Sir H. Drummond Wolff was the active exponent would differ very widely and salutarily from the vacillating no-policy pursued by the late Government in Egypt. Notwithstanding the observation of the right hon. Gentleman the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs that the selection of the right hon. Member for Portsmouth as our Envoy to Cairo did not import any departure from the policy of the late Government towards the Khedive Tewfik personally, he still clung to the hope that this new Mission had a weighty and a valuable meaning from which they might augur the best results. He must express his liveliest satisfaction that Sir H. Drummond Wolff had been specially chosen for that work. On neither side of the House could so competent an agent have been selected for it. He would go with a reputation already made in the East; he was a *persona grata* to the great majority of the Native population of Egypt, and to nearly the whole of the Europeans there; and, whatever might be the personal feelings of the Khedive towards him, he would be welcomed by all classes in Egypt. For himself, he adhered to the notion that there were only two policies which were practically possible for this country in Egypt, although probably neither of them was now popular. The first and best of them would be the policy of establishing our direct Protectorate over that country. We had interests, rights, and claims in Egypt that were equalled by those of no other Power in Europe; and he thought that these rights and interests could be upheld and maintained only by our having absolute and paramount authority in that country. To this, he believed, the only alternative was the restoration of the late Khedive. Of all the Governors who had arisen in the East during the present century Ismail was by far the ablest and the strongest. His administration had admittedly been marred by grave defects; he had made great mistakes in regard to finance, and had allowed himself to be led away by loan-mongers and others, who had reaped fortunes out of those mistakes. But during his Reign a traveller might have journeyed with his pockets full of diamonds from Alexandria to Khartoum without an Arab spear being raised against him. Under him the Soudanese Chiefs, who had baffled the skill of English diplomatists and defied the power of English Generals, had been effectually managed and controlled; and from the Mediterranean to Khartoum peace and relative prosperity had everywhere prevailed, the Slave Trade was being gradually checked, and Egypt, on the whole, was never better governed than it was during his 17 years' Reign. He had been essentially a strong Governor, and strength in the East was the first necessary quality in a Ruler. Therefore, he said that if the first and best solution —namely, either the annexation of Egypt or the establishment of a direct Protectorate over it —was not accepted, the second was well on the cards, and that before many months were over they would probably see the restoration of Ismail Pasha brought within the sphere of practical politics. Turning to the new loan, the immediate subject of the Amendment before the House, he thought the Chancellor of the Exchequer had made a complete answer to the objections of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). The new Government had inherited that loan as a part of the legacy left by their Predecessors; and he could not see how they could well have done better than they had done in the matter. Perhaps a rather better price might have been obtained; but that was a point on which he could not speak with any confidence. Anyhow, he thought they had acted in a way that deserved the recognition of the House; and, therefore, he was not disposed to support the Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question again proposed.

THE PAPAL SEE—DIPLOMATIC COMMUNICATION WITH THE VATICAN—SIR GEORGE ERRINGTON.

MR. O'BRIEN said, he would like to draw the attention of the House as shortly as possible to a matter which had excited a great deal of interest in Ireland, and he believed it had also attracted considerable attention in England and Rome—he referred to the publication of a letter purporting to be, and as he thought he could show actually was, a secret communication between the hon. Baronet the Member for Longford (Sir George Errington) and Lord Granville, with respect to the hon. Baronet's mysterious Mission to the Vatican. His hon. Friends and himself were at first anxious to put a Question directly to the hon. Baronet, as to whether he was or was not the author of this communication. They were prevented by the Forms of the House from doing so, because, although it was now perfectly certain that the hon. Baronet was acting in Rome as the Agent of the English Government, and although, in point of fact, the late Government gave him his Baronetcy because of his services in that capacity, the Irish Members were unable to question him in the capacity. They all knew that the late Government, though they appointed the hon. Baronet to that position, found it necessary, for reasons of their own, upon all occasions to disown him, at least publicly, in that capacity, in deference to English opinion. As they could not put a Question directly to the hon. Baronet, they did the next best thing in order to clear up the question of the genuineness of this document. On Friday night he (Mr. O'Brien) sent a written Notice to the hon. Baronet that upon Monday, on the Motion for going into Committee of Supply on the Appropriation Bill, he meant to bring this matter before the House, so that he might have a full opportunity to either disclaim or avow the letter—if he did avow it, that he might be able to give the House any explanation in his power as to its contents. On Monday night the hon. Baronet did not put in an appearance; but he (Mr. O'Brien) was glad to perceive that to-day the hon. Baronet had changed his mind, and was now in a position to hear him, and speak himself on the subject. He could not help remarking that the hon. Baronet's course of conduct since the publication of this letter was, to say the least, singularly unsatisfactory, if not of a suspicious character. If the hon. Baronet never wrote a letter of that description nothing would be easier than for him to say so over his own name. Instead of that there appeared on Friday a *communique* in *The Daily News*. They all knew that was the official organ of the late Government which employed the hon. Baronet, and it was the paper which generally spoke with some authority; and he did not think it was too much to assume that though the voice was the voice of *The Daily News*, the inspiration was the inspiration of the hon. Baronet the Member for Longford. On Friday there appeared in *The Daily News* this very confident and precise announcement—

> "Sir George Errington has no knowledge of the letter published in *United Ireland* purporting to have been written by the hon. Baronet to Earl Granville on the subject of the Vatican and of the election of an Archbishop of Dublin."

That beyond all doubt was a point-blank denial that any such letter was ever written by the hon. Baronet, and a point-blank statement that the letter was a bogus document. But upon the following day there appeared in *The Daily News* a paragraph of a very hesitating and timid character. It was not his business to account for the change of tone in the two declarations in *The Daily News*. He merely mentioned the fact that in the meantime his hon. Friend the Member for Galway (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) had given Notice in the House of his intention to question the hon. Baronet and sift the matter, and in the meantime the paper in which the document had appeared had come to hand, in which it was stated that they—*United Ireland*—had the original letter in their possession, and that they were perfectly ready to submit it to any friend of the hon. Baronet's who wished to verify the handwriting. In *The Daily News*, as he had stated, a statement appeared to the effect that—

> "Sir George Errington had no recollection of having written such a letter."

And then *The Daily News* went on to make some ridiculous speculations as to the manner in which the letter had been obtained. He would, however, leave the hon. Baronet to settle the matter with *The Daily News*. There had been, however, a change in the tone of *The Daily News* from day to day after it was announced that the Irish Members had evidence of the handwriting in their possession. As to the letter itself, he need hardly say that he was not going to make the smallest apology in the world for giving it to the public. Diplomatists who went in for mean, dirty tricks like this ought to expect no mercy from the Irish Members. The idea of everything that was vital to the religion and liberties of the Catholics of Ireland being trafficked in and bargained for in this miserable way at Rome was most repulsive to all Catholics, and even to every decent Protestant in England. At all events, every effort had been made to smother up the truth concerning this Gentleman's doings at Rome. Every document was refused them and kept under lock and key; and he really regarded it as a dispensation of Providence which had enabled them to clear up the mystery. There was, he believed, no room for conjecture in this matter, for, as far as he was himself concerned, he was satisfied, beyond any reasonable doubt, of the authenticity of the letter before publishing it. He had submitted the letter to several hon. Members who were acquainted with the hon. Baronet's handwriting, and they at once recognized it as his. There had since come into his possession another communication in the undoubted handwriting of the hon. Baronet, addressed to an hon. Member of that House; and he did not think that there would be one moment's hesitation in saying that both letters were in one and the same handwriting. This was the letter which he had felt perfectly secure would be maintained a perfect secret—

> "House of Commons, Friday, 15th May.
>
> "Dear Lord Granville,—The Dublin Archbishoprick (*sic*) being still undecided, I must continue to keep the Vatican in good humour

about you and keep up communication with them generally as much as possible. I am almost ashamed to trouble you again when you are so busy; but perhaps on Monday you would allow me to show you the letter I propose to write. This premature report about Dr. Moran will cause increased pressure to be put on the Pope and create many fresh difficulties. The matter must therefore be most carefully watched, so that the strong pressure I can still command may be used at the right moment, and not too soon or unnecessarily (for too much pressure is quite as dangerous as too little). To effect this constant communication with Rome is necessary.

"I am, dear Lord Granville,
"Faithfully yours,
"GEORGE ERRINGTON."

He could understand the hon. Baronet denying having written that letter; but how any man could forget the writing of that letter certainly exceeded the bounds of belief and credulity. The only fact with reference to the communication which made him doubt its genuineness was the extraordinary unguardedness, levity, and cynicism with which it was written. The hon. Baronet was, he thought, usually regarded by his admirers as a model of Catholic piety. Yet here they had, in his own handwriting, a deliberate insult to His Holiness the Pope. It was almost inconceivable that a serious diplomatist, engaged in what were considered as delicate negotiations, should write such a letter. Upon second thoughts, however, he had come to the conclusion that this was an additional proof of the genuineness of the letter. The secrecy upon the matter which was maintained by the late Government gave the hon. Baronet a most perfect sense of false security. It might, at least, have been justly supposed by him that whatever he might write would never have been perused by the Pope or the people of Ireland. The consequence was that they had the hon. Baronet, from this sense of security, blurting out his mind in a manner that certainly, he thought, would not induce him to boast of his skill as a diplomatist in Rome. He would not try to make a point of the hon. Baronet's denial, that he did not recollect ever having written such a letter. He would, however, say that he did not manifest much skill as a diplomatist in writing such a letter. There was one thing which might be said in its favour. There was no mistake as to the meaning of it. The meaning of it was this. The hon. Baronet wished to inveigle the Pope into appointing the nominee of the late Government to the Archbishopric of Dublin. The hon. Baronet was empowered by the late Government to hold out certain promises, certain considerations to the Court of Rome; and what was worse was that these considerations and promises had evidently not been intended to be performed. Until the Dublin Archbishopric was decided he must continue at the Vatican—that was to say, that the Pope was to be amused, duped, and kept in good humour, and cheated with what he would not hesitate to call dishonest hints, that Lord Granville might open diplomatic relations with the Vatican favouring Catholicity in India and Malta. When the case with regard to the Archbishopric was decided there would be very little further care taken as to the humour which the Pope would be in. He did not like to trust himself to express his opinion about this miserable, unworthy intrigue on the part of an English Minister, and still more on the part of an English Catholic diplomatist. One thing they might congratulate themselves upon, and that was that the diplomacy broke down. The whole thing seemed to be similar to that kind of brilliant success which had characterized the diplomacy of the late Government in other matters. The plot had utterly failed. Lord Granville appeared to be the only person who was in the least imposed upon by the diplomacy of the hon. Baronet. The hon. Baronet, at all events, got his Baronetcy, but Dr. Moran did not get his Archbishopric. He congratulated the hon. Baronet upon having kept Lord Granville in good humour; but the Pope, whom he sneered at in private conference with Lord Granville, seemed to have taken the measure of the hon. Baronet in the whole transaction pretty truly. He did not know how this matter was regarded by English public opinion; but he rather suspected, from the pains taken by the late Government to keep it from the public eye, that they had an uneasy feeling that it would not tend much to their credit among the constituencies at the next General Election. As far as the Irish people were concerned, they regarded it as a vile insult to the Papacy, as well as an outrage upon their own liberty and independence. People, he thought, must regard with humiliation and disgust the spectacle of the English admirers of Cavour and Mazzini sneaking over to the Vatican and endeavouring to get privileges in a miserable and Machiavellian manner. They would appreciate the attempt to invoke the temporal power of the Pope against the liberties and nationality of the Irish people. He ventured to say that after the hon. Baronet had been heard the House would have to admit that the document he had read was a perfectly genuine one, and that the meaning was perfectly clear on the face of it. It seemed to him that the present Government had no course open to them now except to publish every scrap of writing which was in the Foreign Office on this subject. If it was possible to disprove the disgraceful inferences which must be drawn from this letter, it could only be done by the publication of all the Minutes concerning the Mission of the hon. Baronet. Then, at all events, the English and Irish public would be able to appreciate both the religious professions of the hon. Baronet and the morality—the delicate political morality—of the late Government, who were so horror-stricken at the imaginary compact with the Representatives of Ireland, and who were now detected in an attempt to establish a secret, and, what was worse, a dishonest compact with the Pope.

SIR GEORGE ERRINGTON: Before I say the few words I have to say—and they will be much more in the form of an explanation than any contribution to the debate—I wished at first to ask a little further information as to how the document or letter that has been alluded to got into the possession of the hon. Member for Mallow. On second thoughts, I think any such inquiry would be superfluous. One of two things must be absolutely certain. Either this document is not genuine—in that case it must have been forged—or, if it is genuine, it can only have been obtained by a most gross breach of the most elementary laws of honesty and of honour. In fact, Sir, it must have been stolen. I refrain from charging the hon. Member for Mallow with any direct complicity in either one or other of these two alternative transactions. It is enough for me to know this—that he is in possession of a document so obtained, and that he is endeavouring to use it in this House so as to make it impossible for me to give any explanation whatever with regard to it. I received a few days ago from the hon. Member the following note:—

> "Sir,—I beg to give you notice that as the Forms of the House prevent me from asking you whether you are the writer of the letter to Lord Granville, published in this week's *United Ireland*, I mean to bring the letter before the House on the Appropriation Bill on Monday, so that you will then have an opportunity of avowing or denying the authority of the letter."

I must say that on receiving this letter, even from the writer of it, such a citation as this appeared to me quite preposterous. My first impression was that not only I should not be called upon, but should not even have been justified in taking any notice whatever of it, or in coming down here. I thought it should be treated, as I always treat such attacks coming from such quarters, with the indifference and contempt they deserve. On consideration, however, I felt if I were absent I might appear wanting in that courtesy and deference which is due to you, Sir, and the House in general; and, on the other hand, I felt this—that there was no place where I could more effectively appeal to the best principles of honesty, honour, and self-respect than in this House, and no place where any infraction of those principles would be more thoroughly condemned. I owe no duty to make any answer or afford any information whatever to any inquirer or inquiry of this sort.

MR. CALLAN: You owe it to the Pope.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

SIR GEORGE ERRINGTON: If I were to answer to the extent of one word, I should be assisting the hon. Member for Mallow in the ultimate object which he has in view. I should be aiding him in entering upon a discussion in relation to matters the full responsibility of which I am willing to bear to all who have the slightest claim to call me to account. Therefore, taking this view of my position and responsibility, I prefer leaving such a weapon as the hon. Member for Mallow says he has obtained, and seeks to use, unheeded in his hands.

MR. BIGGAR said, he wished to call attention to the inability of the hon.

Baronet to deny the specific charges which had been brought against him by the hon. Member for Mallow. There was a literal document put forward which he had not the manliness either to acknowledge or disprove. He had no reasonable explanation to make for conduct which was utterly indefensible. His whole action in regard to the Vatican was of the most reprehensible character. He had deliberately attempted to mislead the Pope or the advisers of the Pope; but he was quite certain that they would not listen to him for one moment. He had endeavoured to influence parties whom he believed might indirectly communicate with the Pope. He, as a Catholic, certainly held that anyone who would act as the hon. Member for Longford did acted most improperly by that Church. He contended that the Parliament in this country, having refused to authorize the Government to send a properly accredited Representative of Great Britain to the Holy See, it was only the Catholic Cardinals, Archbishops, and Bishops of England and Ireland who had a right to communicate with the Vatican in reference to purely spiritual matters. He regarded the intriguing and under-handed action of the late Government with the Holy See as disgraceful, and as opposed to general English feeling; and he trusted that the result of the conduct of the Whig Party in this matter would be to place them in a minority at the next General Election. He thought that the present Government were bound to publish, in the form of a Blue Book, all the Correspondence that had passed in relation to this matter between Earl Granville and the hon. Baronet.

Mr. P. J. POWER said, that the hon. Baronet had virtually acknowledged having written the document in question; and it was interesting to compare that circumstance with some of the explanations and speeches of the late Prime Minister, wherein he conveyed to the House that his Government knew nothing of any communications carried on with the Vatican. He was not surprised, however, at now learning of the underhand way in which they had conducted negotiations at Rome. He regarded the action of the Government in this matter as thoroughly dishonest. The Irish Members, much as they condemned the Whig Government, did not deem them capable of descending to such measures as this. They had all a recollection of the pamphlets written by the Leader of the late Government, who had in a moment of exceptional candour condemned the Vatican. What, therefore, were they to think of the action of the Government in this matter? He certainly hoped that the present Government would disclose the whole of these negotiations which the document which had been read disclosed. He also hoped that the Vatican and the hierarchy would learn from this a lesson as to the value to be attached to any communication from a Whig Administration. Certainly the Irish people would not easily forget the class of men with whom they had had to deal in the case of the so-called Liberal Administration.

Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, he wished to put a question to the Chancellor of the Exchequer with regard to the recent appointment of a Royal Commission to inquire into the depression of trade and agriculture.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN interposed, and, reminding the Speaker that the hon. Member was entering upon a new subject, asked whether it would not be for the convenience of the House that the discussion upon the last topic should be finished?

Mr. SPEAKER said, that the hon. Member for Salford was perfectly in Order.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD, resuming, said, he desired to know what were the instructions which had been given to the Commission? There was considerable doubt as to the policy of Her Majesty's Government as regarded the great question of free importation as affecting the supply of cheap food for the people. Certain Members of the Government had taken part in a movement that would lead to dear bread, while others were in favour of restrictions upon the importation of live cattle from Germany, which would lead to dear meat. It was most unfortunate that the two Departments of Trade and Agriculture were in the hands of the two most re-actionary Members of the Government—namely, the Duke of Richmond and the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, though he did not say that since coming into Office the latter right hon. Gentleman had failed to carry out the Resolution of the House on this question. He was not surprised that the Party at present in place, but not in power, should seek to refer the investigation of these questions to Royal Commissions, who were not answerable to that House. Some years ago a Royal Commission was appointed by the Government of Lord Beaconsfield to inquire into the subject of agricultural depression, and that Commission cost the country £40,000. If it were intended to pursue the same course now, the investigation would cost an equal amount of money. Could anyone say that the Royal Commission on Agriculture had attained one of the main purposes for which it was appointed? It had utterly failed to promote the interests committed to its care; and from beginning to end of the Report there was not one word of reference to the use of the remarkable discovery of ensilage for the feeding of cattle. He had pressed for the names of the Gentlemen to whom this very important inquiry was to be entrusted, because, when it was known who were to be Members of the Commission, hon. Gentlemen would be able to form a judgment as to whether it was a body which was likely to command the confidence of the country. He was very much disposed to regard the issue of this Royal Commission as a quack remedy. Lately the newspapers had been full of announcements that persons, more or less distinguished, had positively declined to take seats on this Commission; and he assumed that the refusals must have arisen from a feeling in the minds of those persons that they had no adequate assurance of the policy which Her Majesty's Government intended to follow. He would like to remind Her Majesty's Government of what had been said by the two journals most capable of expressing an opinion on the subject of the Commission—namely, *The Times* and *The Economist*. *The Times* had given it the title of a Commission *pour rire*, while *The Economist* remarks—"We predicted that the Commission would be a failure; it is now a *fiasco* as well." Lord Iddesleigh had himself expressed sympathy with the Free Trade policy of the country; but in one of his speeches he admitted that—

> "It is perfectly true that there are men in the Conservative Party who, with very great energy, and, I must say, with very great ability and considerable courage, have argued the question from the Protectionist point of view,"

although his Lordship added that—

> "I am not aware that anyone has put forward the doctrine of Protection otherwise than as a pious opinion."

But whatever might be the opinion of hon. Gentlemen opposite, he was persuaded that the great majority of the people regarded free imports as the best security for the supply of cheap food; and the question now was whether cheap meat and cheap bread were to be treated with respect by the present Government? That question would have to be faced by the Conservative Party at the approaching General Election. Referring to the Copyhold Enfranchisement Bill, which contained nothing of a revolutionary character, the hon. Member regretted the action of the Peers with regard to it, and mentioned the circumstance that Mr. Nicholson, who was Clerk of the Peace for Middlesex, and also the Marquess of Salisbury's private solicitor, sent out a Circular to all stewards of manors throughout the Kingdom with the view of bringing about the rejection of that important measure by the House of Lords. It was impossible, he thought, that Mr. Nicholson could have issued this Circular unless he knew he was acting in a way which would give pleasure to the Prime Minister. He was very much shocked the other day to see evidence of an extraordinary internal dissension in the Conservative Party, especially with reference to the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India. [Mr. WARTON: Oh, oh!] Not long ago the noble Lord, when addressing a meeting in Lancashire, suggested that a tax should be levied upon all foreign imports, and said that it would be an easy thing in that way to raise £20,000,000 sterling, which, he proposed, should be devoted to the relief of the agricultural burdens. Many people in Lancashire, when they read those words, were of opinion that the noble Lord had no idea worthy of a statesman, because they saw that if taxation were imposed to the extent of £20,000,000 on foreign imports that large sum could not be raised except by enormous taxation on the food of the people. The hon. and learned

Member opposite exclaimed "Oh!" when he proposed to allude in passing to the internal dissensions of the Conservative Party. He had observed those dissensions with astonishment, for the noble Lord appeared to be a Member of that House who was of a frank and disingenuous character. He remembered an expression used by the late Lord Beaconsfield that Conservative Government was organized hypocrisy There was, however, no Member on the other side of the House who was less open to a charge of hypocrisy than the noble Lord the Member for Woodstock. The noble Lord had given an explanation with reference to the Irish policy of the Government; but an explanation was really not required from him, but from the Lord Chancellor of Ireland and from the First Commissioner of Works. He should like to know how it was possible for them, without being guilty of the charge of hypocrisy, to join a Government which had come to a distinct resolution on an important point of Irish policy before they had had an opportunity of examining the official documents relating to the subject? Gentlemen opposite had profited by the political nimbleness of the noble Lord, and it showed the greatest ingratitude on them to turn round upon him. He saw the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland smile. The right hon. Gentleman recently assured the House that the Government were not going into a line of unbounded gambling.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE), interposing, said, he had never used such an expression.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD, while accepting the repudiation of the words, said, his ears must have deceived him if he did not recently hear the right hon. Gentleman apologize for gambling; but, however that might be, it was certain that political gambling was the policy of Her Majesty's Government, and the mass of the people had some fear of what might happen during the Recess, when there would be no control exerciseable over the vagaries of Her Majesty's present Advisers.

MR. ELTON said, he desired to express his regret that the House of Lords should not have found time to pass the Copyhold Enfranchisement Bill, which he considered, on the whole, a good, sound, working measure. With regard to Mr. Nicholson, whose name had been introduced in the discussion, he might remark that that gentleman had been almost the only official opponent of the measure during the four years it had been before the country.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: I am rather surprised no Member of Her Majesty's late Government has got up to take part in the debate raised by my hon. Friend the Member for Mallow (Mr. O'Brien). They are the persons whose conduct is chiefly called into account. The hon. Member for Longford (Sir George Errington) plays in this as insignificant a part as in the other affairs of political life. The real point at issue is the attitude of Her Majesty's late Government to the Court of Rome, and to the appointments in the Catholic Church in Ireland. The hon. Member for the County of Longford was sent to Rome in order to bring the pressure of the Vatican to bear upon the priesthood of Ireland. The hon. Baronet had no official position, and yet he was the Representative of the late Government at the Vatican. I wish to know whether the late Government had a right to employ an agent, and, while so employing him, had a right to deny all responsibility for his actions, and to give misleading answers in that House in reply to Questions having reference to the connection that existed between him and them. Now, this Errington Mission dates from a period long anterior to that from which my hon. Friend the Member for Mallow has started. It dates from the Chief Secretaryship of the right hon. Member for Bradford (Mr. W. E. Forster). As the House is aware, the right hon. Member for Bradford had a large number of men in prison without trial. He boasted himself that he had all the murderers in Ireland under lock and key at the very moment when a murderous conspiracy was under his very feet and seeking his own life. But he found that the more men were put in gaol the more crimes were committed; and then, with characteristic cleverness, he arrived at this idea—that it was the priesthood of Ireland who were responsible for the crime of Ireland. Now, he did not think he could venture to imprison many of the priests of Ireland—he had imprisoned one, and he shrank before the storm thus created. Unable to exercise influence over the priests himself, he conceived the idea that he would bring the pressure upon them of their ecclesiastical superiors, thus he came to send Mr. Errington to Rome. Now, Sir, I wish to make two observations on this Mission. First—I congratulate the hon. Member for Longford on his acceptance of the theory of the man who sent him—that the priests of Ireland were the men who preached and incited to assassination; and, secondly, I want to ask what is the position of the British Government, that took the position of calling in the Pope to assist them in ruling a British Dependency? I do not desire to make any uncomplimentary allusion to the share of the late Prime Minister (Mr. Gladstone) in this transaction, as he is absent.

MR. CALLAN: He said he knew nothing about it.

MR. T. P. O'CONNOR: And, as he said, he had nothing to do with it. But the muse of history must have smiled as he recorded the fact that the author of *Vaticanism* and the other pamphlets was the very man to appeal to the Vatican to help him in doing his own work of governing Ireland. What was the main thesis of these pamphlets. What was the principal argument of these brilliant writings against the Pope if it were not that he was a foreign potentate interfering in the internal affairs of other countries; and yet here is the author of these same pamphlets calling on that same potentate to intervene in the relations between England and Ireland. With regard to the hon. Member for Longford, I join my hon. Friend the hon. Member for Mallow in congratulating him on the success with which he has got his part of the bargain. He has his Baronetcy. I confess, Mr. Speaker, that I am as unable to understand the type of man who yearns for a Baronetcy, as I am to understand the type of a man who wears stays; but as I have credible information that there are men who wear stays, I accept the fact that there are men who desire Baronetcies. The hon. Gentleman then has got his Baronetcy; but if he be as zealous a supporter of the Catholic Church as he professes to be, I think he ought to have some qualms of conscience as to the price he paid for it. What did he represent himself to be to the Pope? A Representative of Irish opinion. Why, Sir, if he so represented himself, did he take care to add that the last time that he visited his constituency he had to run away through the back-door of his hotel? So exuberant and excessive was the enthusiasm of his constituents that he did not dare to trust himself to it lest he should be overwhelmed. Does he not know how that while he posed at Rome as a Representative of Irish opinion he could not give an account of his Mission on any platform in the County Longford, with which I have some acquaintance, without requiring a large protective force? And what was his attitude to the vacant Archbishopric? One man was pointed out by the universal voice of Ireland for his great abilities, his spotless character, his profound learning, and, above all, by his known and undisguised sympathy with the national aspirations of his own country and his own people. Suppose the hon. Member for Longford had succeeded in his purposes; suppose he had succeeded in getting some nominee of his and of the British Government appointed; and suppose, further, that this letter read by my hon. Friend the Member for Mallow had been published after the appointment, what would have been the result? Suppose, after the appointment of the nominee of England instead of the nominee of Ireland this letter had been published, showing that the Holy See had been cheated, cajoled, humoured, and subjected to pressure from a Protestant Government, what would have been the result among the Irish people? This, that they would be convinced that the foremost See in their Church and in their country was not the reward of eminent piety and learning and character; but was the price of as corrupt a bargain as the lowest ward politician was ever responsible for. I leave the hon. Member for Longford to strike the nice balance between his Baronetcy and the injury he thus sought to inflict on a cause he professes to hold sacred. With regard to the late Administration, I challenge them to give some explanation of this proceeding. I am not foolish enough, however, to suppose they will take up the challenge. The other night their reactionary Leader (the Marquess of Hartington) gave to the Liberal Party their cry for the coming appeal to the English and Scotch constituencies. That cry was hatred and injustice to Ireland and the Irish people. If the noble Lord were not a Whig, and thus accustomed to rapid and violent changes of opinion, and to the treacherous treatment of Ireland, he might have thought that the Liberal Party was going in 1885 to the country on the same anti-Irish cry as the Party of Lord Beaconsfield in 1880. I wonder the Liberal Party does not adopt a "No Popery" cry also. The reason must be that they feel conscious of the use they, representing a Ministry of eminent Protestants, had attempted to make of the Pope and the religious feelings of the Irish people.

Mr. BOORD said, he desired to call the attention of the House to the case of the widow of the late Sergeant Rance, who had been killed by the explosion of a live shell which was being tested with a peculiarly sensitive fuse at Shoeburyness in February last. The widow had been awarded a pension of only £10 12*s.* 6*d.* per annum, and a gratuity of £44 in respect of her six children. He was well aware that the Government were tied by hard and fast rules; but it was quite competent for them to unmake the rules and replace them by others. About 10 years ago, when a similar explosion occurred, the attention of the Government was called to the rules, and some relaxation was promised; but nothing had been done. He would remind Her Majesty's Government that by the Treasury Minute the widow of Sergeant Rance was entitled to ten-sixtieths of her husband's pay. His pay was 31*s.* a-week, and ten-sixtieths of that would be more than the amount which had been granted her. He hoped that the Government would relax these rules, and make special provision for the case of men who were engaged in exceptionally dangerous employment. It seemed absurd to award a sum of 3*s.* 10*d.* a-week to a widow whose husband was killed in the service of the State.

Mr. MOLLOY said, he wished to join in the appeal which had been already made to the Government to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the present condition of intermediate education in this country. In his opinion the pledges which were given by a Liberal Ministry at the passing of the Education Act with regard to voluntary schools had not been kept. On several occasions the late Prime Minister had expressed his sense of the great value of voluntary schools, and had promised that increased support should be given to them. Not one of the pledges given on this subject by a Liberal Government had been kept, and board schools supported from the rates were now sharing in the grant given for the purpose of voluntary schools. He submitted that the present system of education in this country was most unfair and unjust. The board schools, he might be told, were open to all. That was true in one sense; but it must be remembered that children in entering those schools had to give up their religion, or, at any rate, had to give up combining secular education with religious education. Then he wished to point out that expenditure on education was increasing enormously. This was a matter which ought to receive immediate attention. With regard to the proposition of Miss Helen Taylor that school pence should be dispensed with, he might remark that it meant the pauperization of the whole system of public education in this country. Whether that was a good thing or not it was for Parliament to consider. In his opinion the proposal introduced a principle of a very dangerous character. Looking at the general position of public education in this country he thought he was perfectly justified in asking that a Royal Commission should be appointed to inquire into it.

The VICE PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL (Mr. E. Stanhope) said, that the hon. Member had supported an appeal which had been made on the Ministerial side of the House to the Government to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the working of the Education Act. He could not disguise from himself the fact that this question was regarded with great interest in the country; and he might say that the Government had the greatest possible sympathy with the hon. Member, and with the object he had at heart. Although he could not say that the Government saw the necessity of appointing a Royal Commission to inquire into that question, yet the subject in all its aspects would receive their most careful and fairest attention; and if they found that their information in regard to it was insufficient, they would not scruple to take the ordinary course which ought to be taken in those cases, and to ask for the assistance of a Commission.

Mr. M'COAN said, he rose to complain of the manner in which the Attorney General for Ireland and the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant had answered Questions which he had recently put in the House in regard to the non-execution of a warrant to enforce payment of the fine of £500 inflicted by the Irish Court of Queen's Bench upon the hon. Member for Mallow (Mr. O'Brien).

Mr. BIGGAR rose to Order, and observed that the hon. Member for Wicklow had already spoken in that debate.

Mr. SPEAKER pointed out that the hon. Member for Wicklow's previous speech was made on the Amendment.

Mr. M'COAN, continuing, remarked that while he quite recognized the fact that if a Minister of the Crown thought that to answer a particular Question put to him would prejudice the public interests he might, in the exercise of his discretion, refuse to reply to it, yet he held that it was due both to the whole House and to any independent Member of it who asked a Question that he should be treated with some respect. He was not there to whitewash the Members of the late Government; but if the ex-Attorney General for Ireland or the ex-Chief Secretary had failed to do their duty in respect to the execution of that warrant, that was no reason why their successors should also neglect theirs. He absolutely disclaimed all personal animus in this matter; but he held that the editor of an influential Nationalist journal ought not to have been suffered to snap his fingers at the law, either by the late or the present Government, and that such warrants as that against the hon. Member for Mallow should be executed without favour or affection, or regard to Party considerations of any kind. Instead, however, of receiving a civil answer to his Questions on the subject, the Chief Secretary had presumed to reply with a snub, which, however, being undeserved, recoiled on the head of the Minister who had so far forgotten his duty to the House.

Mr. NEWDEGATE said, he desired to express his gratitude to Her Majesty's Government for appointing a Commission to inquire into the depression of trade and agriculture. It was a long series of years since an impartial inquiry had been made into the condition of the trade and agriculture of the country; and the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) seemed to have pointed him (Mr. Newdegate) out as one who desired an inquiry into the state of agriculture, and not that of trade. Now, seeing that he had not taken part in the debate on the subject, that seemed to be rather an unfair attack. He was under a deep impression that the system of free imports, to which this country had so strictly adhered, had placed her in such a position that other countries found that we had nothing to exchange for any advantages which they might offer. That was the case alike with Germany, France, and the United States of America. Well, he humbly conceived that that was a foolish position for any great commercial country to occupy. We were incapable of dealing with other nations, because we had nothing to offer them. We were precluded from doing so by our own action; and he trusted that the Commission would be composed of unprejudiced and impartial men, who would look upon this great national question in a spirit of perfect impartiality. He confessed that he was surprised at the hon. Member for Salford overlooking the question of the state of trade entirely. The hon. Member was the Representative of a large manufacturing town; and he (Mr. Newdegate) represented a large and populous manufacturing and agricultural county, where, during the last seven or eight years, the depression was almost unexampled. He held, therefore, that Her Majesty's Government were right in using the power of the Crown to inquire into the circumstances which had characterized that depression. That opinion he had long entertained; and he could not forget that, throughout the whole agitation in favour of establishing the system of free imports, its advocates had maintained that our example would lead to reciprocity on the part of foreign nations. That prediction had not been fulfilled; and he thought it time that the Government of this country should now take measures to inquire why the trade and agriculture of the country should have been for so long a period in a state of depression.

Sir PATRICK O'BRIEN: I think I am entitled to say a word or two upon the Errington Mission, on the ground that since any relative of mine has been known in Ireland they were either Pagan or Catholic. During the present debate we have heard several Gentlemen who ought to be in white sheets, with candles before them, repenting their past life, instead of teaching men of their persuasion the lives they ought to pursue. I speak of my hon. Friend the Member for Longford, because, coming Election or no Election, the man is not worth his salt that does not stand up for his friend when his friend is subjected to bitter criticism. May I, as an older Member than he, offer my hon. Friend the Member for Longford my opinion that he would have done better if, instead of making as he had a neat speech, he had contented himself with saying two things—"If this letter is a forgery, *cædet questio.* If it is a robbery, in the House of Commons I decline to notice it." Hon. Gentlemen have made statements here as to what they owe to the Whigs, and what they have lost for them, and what they owe to hon. Gentlemen to whom they are at present allied. Should I be out of Order in asking whether two of the persons that supported, at the Court of Rome, the appointment of the learned, able, honest, and pious ecclesiastic, revered by the Irish people, were not the right hon. Members for Chelsea and Birmingham? Were I born in the days years ago, when the great question of veto was presented to the Irish people, I would be here, like O'Connell of that day, the antagonist of that veto. But what are hon. Gentlemen of the Irish Party to do with their new faith newly created, which was created from Protestantism or from Agnosticism, and the newspapers connected with it, making it necessary here, as a political arrangement, to drag through the mud a great faith, that will live when they are dead, and when, God knows, they will be forgotten. Sir, I see a noble Lord here to-day (Lord Randolph Churchill), and before this debate closes it may be well that one who properly is looked upon as the Leader of a great Party, because he has asserted himself, and sat upon those who are nominally believed to be the Conservative Party—this thorough Democrat—it may be well for him to add to the many things he has done in England to render himself distinguished by speaking. I forget the exact time—it was, I think, some 30 or 40 years ago—that Lord Eglinton prevented a diplomatic arrangement with the Holy See when the question was presented to the Legislature, although it occurred to me at the time that such an arrangement would conduce to the interests of peace—a course I was surprised at, seeing that Independents, Baptists, and other Nonconformists outnumbered Roman Catholics in the House—and knowing the High Church tendencies of the Conservative Party I did not expect such a proceeding from Lord Eglinton, who was one of their number. But at the present time we may hope that the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) may reverse the action pursued by Lord Eglinton. He, a member of a ducal family who, in former days, were rather doubtful in their politics! To-day they were followers of William, the day before they were followers of James. They have pursued their way not alone by means of the men of their families. They had a man who could conquer on the Continent, and whose name was a song to frighten children in the arms of their nursemaids; but then there was in England a woman who was of service. The Sarah of former days has passed away; but may there not be in the present time a great feminine descendant of the great dukedom of Marlborough, competent to occupy Sarah's vacant Throne? I am speaking in this way of one who is endeared to his friends. Why, I can see the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary with an affectionate look upon his face such as I have never seen upon it before. There is not a man who has an eye in his head who does not know that the hon. Gentleman who represents *United Ireland* and the town of Mallow in this House has been caught hold of by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland, and kissed upon both cheeks, and asked to assault those damned Whigs. [*Cries of* "Order!" *and* "Withdraw!"] Very well, I will withhold that observation in consideration of the feelings of hon. Gentlemen.

Mr. SPEAKER, interrupting, said, that the hon. Member was transgressing the latitude of speech allowed even on the Appropriation Bill. He must ask him to confine his observations to the Question before the House.

SIR PATRICK O'BRIEN: In deference to the ruling of the Chair, I will content myself with saying that I think the hon. Baronet the Member for Longford would be warranted in saying that, before he answered any attack made upon him with reference to documents which have appeared in the Press, the way in which those papers got into the hands of those who have used them should be explained.

COLONEL NOLAN said, he wished to call attention to the necessity of advancing more public money for harbour purposes, and to the sources from which £60,000 or £70,000 could be obtained. He would suggest that the £8,000 a-year given to Irish harbours, which was discontinued since the passing of the Piers and Harbours Act, should be again given for that purpose.

MR. J. G. TALBOT said, he wished to emphasize what had been said by the hon. Member for King's County (Mr. Molloy) in his interesting speech upon the condition of the voluntary schools of the country. He rejoiced at the encouragement already given to the supporters of those schools by his right hon. Friend the Vice President of the Council. But he hoped he would go a little further. Voluntary schools carried on their work without expense to the ratepayers, and he thought that there was excellent ground for the suggested inquiry. The School Board had been reckless in its expenditure; there was more than a suspicion of over-pressure upon teachers and scholars; and he would, therefore, once more urge upon the Government the necessity of considering the whole question, and, if need be, appointing a Royal Commission. He was sure that if his right hon. Friend could see his way to appoint a Royal Commission, much good would come of it.

MR. LYULPH STANLEY wished to tell the Vice President of the Council, as he had introduced that question, that it would not be wise for the friends of the denominational system to re-open the compromise. If they did re-open the matter, he could promise the right hon. Gentleman that they were in danger of losing the support of the friends of sectarian education which they now enjoyed, and further demands would be made in the direction of popular and elective control. It was not fit that an avowedly stop-gap Government should go to the expense of appointing a Royal Commission, when they would have to go hat in hand all over the country to get decent men to compose it, or that they should prejudge great and important questions of this kind as they had done—questions which would have to be decided by the great masses now enfranchised.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD said, he hoped that before Parliament was prorogued the Government would say what they intended to do with regard to Aberystwith College.

MR. CALLAN said, that he had intended to refer at some length to a matter of considerable importance; but he thought that at that hour (5.35 P.M.) it would better suit the convenience of the House if he postponed his remarks until another occasion, as he had no desire to prevent the Appropriation Bill being read a third time.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed.*

UNIVERSITIES (SCOTLAND) BILL.

(*The Lord Advocate, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland.*)

[BILL 115.] SECOND READING.

BILL WITHDRAWN.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS), in moving that the Order for the second reading of the Bill be discharged, said, he regretted very much that a Bill which he believed would have been of great use, and which was very much wanted in Scotland, should not have been allowed to pass. So far as he could learn, public opinion in Scotland was very much in favour of this Bill, and the persons who were opposed to it were small in number, and were becoming smallar and smaller. He, therefore, regretted that hon. Members opposite had pushed their objections to the Bill in the way they had. At that time of the Session, it was quite impossible that they could force the Bill through, and on the shoulders of those hon. Members who opposed it must fall the responsibility for its abandonment.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Order for the Second Reading be read and discharged,"—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross,*)—put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *withdrawn.*

POLICE ENFRANCHISEMENT EXTENSION BILL.—[Bill 219.]

(*Mr. Coleridge Kennard, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, Mr. Cowen, Lord Claud John Hamilton, Mr. Robert Fowler, Mr. Reid, Mr. Houldsworth, Mr. George Elliot.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

Mr. MORGAN LLOYD said, he begged to move the adjournment of the debate, on the ground that the Bill could not be fairly discussed at that period of the Session.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be now adjourned."—(*Mr. Morgan Lloyd.*)

Sir HENRY JAMES said, he was unwilling to talk the Bill out. But as the Motion for Adjournment had been made, and only one minute of time remaining, it was useless to take a division. He must, however, remind the House that when this matter was under discussion on a former occasion, it was felt that the police, in times of excitement, ought not to have political power, and the House resolved unanimously that they should not have it. On that ground alone he thought that an opportunity for discussing the Bill should be given.

It being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned till *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at ten minutes before Six o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Thursday, 6*th August,* 1885.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Consolidated Fund (Appropriation)*; East India Army Pensions Deficiency * (239).

Second Reading—Public Works Loans* (234); Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2) (235).

Committee—Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (170).

Committee — Report — Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) * (231).

Third Reading—Poor Law Unions' Officers (Ireland) (214-237); River Thames (No. 2) (218-238), *debate adjourned;* Evidence by Commission * (228); Telegraph Acts Amendment* (230); Expiring Laws Continuance (229), and *passed.*

Royal Assent—Customs and Inland Revenue (No. 2) [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 51]; Submarine Telegraph Cables [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 49]; Medical Relief Disqualification Removal [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 46]; Bankruptcy (Office Accommodation) [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 47]; Public Health (Members and Officers) [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 53]; Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 50]; Ecclesiastical Commissioners (No. 2) [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 55]; Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt Practices) [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 56]; Pluralities [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 54]; Lunacy Acts Amendment [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 52]; Revising Barristers [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 57]; Earldom of Mar Restitution [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 48]; Public Health (Scotland) Provisional Order (No. 2) [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. cxxvii].

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS BILL.—(No. 170.)

(*The Marquess of Waterford.*)

COMMITTEE.

House in Committee (according to Order).

Lord ELPHINSTONE, in rising to move an Amendment, to the effect that the smaller towns which the Dublin Corporation Waterworks supplied should receive a supply of 25 gallons per head of the population per day, instead of 20 gallons as at present, said, that, before doing so, he wished to explain why he, as Chairman of the Select Committee to which the Bill was referred, should ask their Lordships to accept an Amendment which that Committee threw out. The facts were these. The Dublin Corporation Waterworks supplied several smaller towns situated between that City and the sources of the supply. The smaller towns were supplied under separate and Local Acts, all of which were similar in character. They enacted that each centre of population should be supplied with 20 gallons of water per head per day; and that if any additional quantity were supplied a rate should be levied on the rateable value of the several towns. Some of these towns were favourite watering places. All of them were becoming, year by year, places of greater resort, and their population was annually increasing. The Dublin Corporation stated they had difficulty in ascertaining the extent to which the population increased, and what additional quantity of water was required, and this Provisional Orders Bill was intended to obviate that difficulty. It was shown to the Committee that while the supply to the smaller towns was limited to 20 gallons per head daily, the consumption of water by the population of Dublin was 38 gallons. It was true that the smaller towns might obtain additional water; but all in excess of the 20 gallons was charged for as assessed water. There was no question as to the amount of water available, for the supply was greater than the demand. At any rate, for the greater portion of the year the water ran to waste to the extent of 2,000,000 gallons daily. It was also shown to the Committee that there was every reason to hope that the Corporation debt would be paid off early in the next century, and when the witness who used the expression was questioned about it, he said the debt would be cleared off within 20 or 25 years. The Committee sat for five hours one day, and seven hours the next day. They listened to every argument advanced by counsel and against the Bill. Very few Committees had paid more attention to a Bill than was paid to this. The Committee decided unanimously to pass the Bill as it stood, and to insert a clause to provide that the supply of water to the smaller towns should be 25 gallons per head per day, instead of 20 gallons, as heretofore. It was only fair to say that one noble Lord, a Member of the Committee, had demurred; but he had not objected to the granting of the excess water. He was prepared to grant 25 gallons in lieu of 20 gallons; but he foresaw certain difficulties in giving effect to the Resolution of the Committee. However, the noble Lord had not pressed his objection, and the Committee came to the conclusion stated unanimously. The effect of that decision would have been that Dublin would have obtained what it asked for—that was to say, they would have been able to estimate the population of the small towns; whilst the position of the small towns would have been improved, as they would get what they desired—a larger allowance of water. The Committee felt that it was a compromise—indeed, they had every reason to believe it was a compromise—which might be, and they thought would have been, gladly accepted by all parties. It injured no one. There was no want of water, and, as he had said, within a measurable distance of time there was every reason to hope that the Corporation debt would be paid off. The Committee, therefore, instructed counsel to draw up a clause giving effect to these decisions. After the clause was drawn up, not one could be prepared which seemed to meet the wishes of the opposing parties. Three-quarters of an hour was spent in a vain endeavour to draw up a clause, and the Committee then had to clear the Committee Room. The noble Lord (Lord Carlingford), who was now abroad, but who had been a Member of the Committee, had suggested that the proposed clause should not be inserted, and after some consultation the Committee divided, with the result that the noble Duke (the Duke of Marlborough) and himself (Lord Elphinstone) were left in a minority of two to three. The Bill was therefore left in the same position in which it had come before the Committee. Since then he had received a communication from the noble Lord (Lord Truro), saying he was quite prepared to restore the clause as the Committee originally proposed it; and he had also received a similar assent from another noble Lord who was a Member of the Committee. Under those circumstances, he came before the House backed by the originally unanimous decision of the Committee, and by the fact that four noble Lords had expressed their wish that the clause might be restored. The noble Lord to whom he had referred as having any doubt in the matter had not been unfavourable to the increased grant of water, and therefore he (Lord Elphinstone) had the honour to move the following clause of which he had given Notice, and which he hoped their Lordships would accept.

Moved, after Clause 2, to insert the following Clause:—

"For the purposes of the eighth section of the Dublin Corporation Waterworks and Fire Brigade Provisional Order, 1874, and of the Orders hereby confirmed, the statutable or contract allowance of water to the townships mentioned in that section shall be deemed to be twenty-five gallons per head per day, instead of twenty gallons per head per day, as provided by the Acts in that section mentioned relating to those townships respectively, and the said Orders and Acts shall be read and have effect accordingly."—(*The Lord Elphinstone.*)

Question proposed, "That the said Clause be there inserted."

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD said, he was informed that the Local Government Board could not agree to the Amendment which his noble Friend (Lord Elphinstone) had just now moved. He (the Marquess of Waterford) had been astonished to hear the statement the noble Lord had made, because the noble Lord had led their Lordships to understand that the Committee had unanimously placed in the Bill a clause giving 25 gallons a-day per head to the townships. But exactly the reverse was the case. The Committee had thrown out the clause—they would not adopt it. It was so stated on the Minutes. They had now, according to the noble Lord, thought better of that action; but certainly the Bill had been reported to their Lordships without Amendment. There was no Amendment of the sort appearing in the Bill; and, in addition to that, in the Minutes passed by the Committee there was a remark by the noble Chairman (Lord Elphinstone) himself, in which he said that some of the Committee had been anxious to put the five gallons extra per head per day for the townships in the Bill, but that, as it was contested, they could not do so. There were several objections in the way, and, therefore, they could not carry it out. The proposal now renewed had been several times inquired into. It had been, in the first place, very carefully considered by the Irish Local Government Board, who had heard an immense amount of evidence upon it. It was then fought in the Court of Queen's Bench in Dublin, which decided in favour of the Corporation, allowing the Provisional Order to stand. The matter then went up to the Court of Appeal in Ireland, and upon that occasion the Lord Chancellor, he (the Marquess of Waterford) was informed, spoke very strongly upon it in favour of the Provisional Order. That Order was a most ample one and a most fair one, and he asked their Lordships not to accept the Amendment. In the original Act the water supply was limited in all the towns that had been referred to to 20 gallons per head per day; and it was arranged that any increased quantity should depend upon the increase of the population. It was found difficult to estimate the population; and the Corporation went to the Local Government Board to get a Provisional Order which should help them on this point. The arrangement come to was that they should take the Census of 1881, and add for each subsequent year one-tenth of the increase that took place between the years 1871 and 1881. If now the House accepted the Amendment, they would upset every Local Act which these townships had obtained. They entered into a bargain to pay 4*d.* in the pound for a supply of 20 gallons of water in the day. And, now, when the Corporation asked that the population should be defined, the townships put in a claim of five gallons per head per day more. There were nine townships, of which four only opposed this Provisional Order — Kingstown, Bray, Blackrock, and Clontarf. In Dublin, the water rate was 1*s.* 3*d.* in the pound. In the townships, for 20 gallons a-day, it was 4*d.*; and now the townships wished to continue to pay 4*d.*, but to receive 25 gallons. That would be to repeal the Local Acts, without any notice whatever having been given of such an intention. The passing of the Amendment would occasion the Dublin Corporation enormous expenditure in order to enlarge their works. The noble Lord had pointed out that the population was increasing in the towns. He was sure their Lordships would be pleased to hear it; but that fact was all in favour of the townships, and was no reason why they should have more water per head for the present price. They could have as much more as they liked on the assessment of 2½*d.* per 1,000 gallons. He hoped their Lordships would not accept this Amendment, which had been sprung upon the Corporation at the last moment.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, there could be no doubt that this question was one of considerable importance. He had not had much experience of Committees in this House; but he had been a Member of the Committee which had sat to consider the question. They had come unanimously to a certain decision—namely, that the supply of water should be increased to 25 gallons per head, and that that should be a condition on which the Provisional Order should be passed. That having been the decision of the Committee, it became a question as to how that decision should be embodied. Some Members of the Committee thought it would not be practicable for them to draw it up themselves; and, inasmuch as the counsel were not able to agree to it, the room was cleared for the purpose of consulting as to what form the Provision should take. One Member of the Committee (Lord Carlingford) thought it would be impossible to draw it up without clashing with existing legislation, and divided the Committee on the point; but he (the Duke of Marlborough) submitted that the real decision of the Committee was come to when the Chairman announced to counsel on both sides the decision to allow the increased quantity of water to the townships. The matter, he held, was decided by that decision, and the conclusion arrived at ultimately was not in form. Whether or not that view would meet the approval of their Lordships, he would not presume to say. The case of the townships, he asserted, was one of considerable hardship, the Provisional Order of 1874, as it stood, being an unworkable Order. The word "population," there defined, was no criterion as to how population should be adjudged, and it was therefore necessary for the Corporation to get a new Provisional Order in which the word "population" was properly defined. In the present Order, therefore, that matter was clearly defined on the principle of the Census, which, by the decision of the Law Courts in Dublin, was not accepted as the criterion of population when the suit came on between the Kingstown and Dublin Corporations. He ventured to think that when the Dublin Corporation came to Parliament and asked for an enabling Order, that was the only opportunity those growing minor townships had of getting better terms from this large and growing Corporation; and he therefore also thought it right that they should endeavour to acquire for themselves advantages which they could not hope to obtain under other circumstances. It was not the same thing as if they were dealing with a private Water Company, which required an Order for its protection in the enjoyment of its rights. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Waterford) had said that the Local Government Board (Ireland) did not approve the Amendment; but that would not prevent their Lordships from accepting it. The proposal would not affect the Private Acts of the smaller towns. The Amendment only provided that, where those Acts spoke of 20 gallons, henceforth 25 gallons should be understood. Then it was said the Corporation would have to go to great expense for new works; but it was clearly shown in Committee that the water was running to waste, and that there was no difficulty in increasing the supply. On all those grounds, he thought the case of the minor towns was very strong. The Committee having once come to a decision, that decision should be upheld, for the after proceedings of the Committee were quite irregular. He therefore supported the Amendment.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord HALSBURY) said, the question raised in this case, in regard to procedure, was exactly the reverse of that raised the other day in regard to the Tramways Bill. In this case, as he understood, the Committee was desirous of increasing the supply of water if they could; but they found that they could not do so, because of existing bonds and previous Acts of Parliament. If their Lordships now passed the clause, it would be equivalent to saying that the Committee was wrong, and that the additional supply should be given in spite of bargains and previous legislation. One of the chief causes of the difficulties that arose in connection with the construction of Acts of Parliament was due to clauses being introduced in this way without sufficient consideration of the effect that they might have on existing Acts of Parliament. If the Committee had abstained from doing what they desired to do because of the difficulty of dealing with the matter in this Bill, their Lordships would do well to reject the Amendment. At all events, he trusted they would not agree to the clause without inquiring into its effect.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, the noble and learned Lord upon the Woolsack was under a misapprehension as to the decision of the Committee. They decided that a certain clause should be inserted as the condition on which they granted the Order.

Lord FITZGERALD said, he hoped the Amendment would be agreed to, for the matter was one of the first importance as a sanitary question. Twenty years ago the Corporation of Dublin obtained power to appropriate the waters of the Vartry River. That power was given to them as Trustees, and they were bound to supply the township with 20 gallons per head per day. That was now recognized as a clearly insufficient supply, for the average supply of most of the London Water Companies averaged from 23 to 30 gallons per head per day. The Committee had reported that 30 gallons had been asked for simply as a compromise. Nothing was proposed to be taken from the Dublin Corporation. They did not require half the water, and the consequence was that a large quantity was daily allowed to run to waste. The Corporation, however, stood on its rights, and said it would give nothing beyond the 20 gallons. The Committee took the view that the townships were entitled to an additional supply, and they recommended that a clause to that effect should be added to the Bill. It was a mistake to suppose that there had, in this case, been any inquiry made by the Local Government Board (Ireland), or that there had been any Report. If it went to the Local Government Board, they would report in favour of 30 gallons instead of 25. If they passed the clause they would not be violating any contract, but would only be substituting right for wrong. Instead of allowing 2,000,000 or 3,000,000 gallons of water to run to waste daily, they would be giving a portion of it to the townships. He hoped their Lordships would pass the clause.

The Earl of MILLTOWN said, if this were a proposal to give the outlying townships an additional supply of water on condition that they gave a fair price for it, no one could object to it. With every disposition to give them help in obtaining what they sought, what he objected to was the contention that a Bill of this kind, which had nothing to do with the supply of water, but only the ascertaining of the population, should be considered a fair opportunity to compel the Dublin Corporation to give them better terms than those already agreed upon as regarded the supply of water. That was to say, they took advantage of the Bill to ask for 25 gallons per head per day at the present price of 20 gallons. As he had said, he was most anxious to assist the townships to obtain sufficient water; but having listened with the very greatest attention to the arguments that had been brought forward, he had come to the conclusion that the proposal was a very unreasonable one.

On Question? Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 19; Not-Contents 20: Majority 1.

Resolved in the *negative.*

Amendment made.

The Report of the Amendment to be received *To-morrow;* and Standing Order No. XXXV. to be considered in order to its being dispensed with.

POOR LAW UNIONS' OFFICERS (IRELAND) BILL.

(*The Marquess of Waterford.*)

(NO. 214.) THIRD READING.

Bill read 3ª (according to Order).

On Motion, "That the Bill do pass?"

The Marquess of WATERFORD said, the Bill had been introduced under the impression that it afforded distinct advantages to medical officers connected with Unions. It seemed, however, that the medical officers had taken alarm, and were afraid that some of their rights were going to be taken away. The Council of the Irish Medical Society had communicated with him, and pressed him to introduce an Amendment to remove that impression. He warned them that the effect might be to endanger the Bill; but as they thought the matter important, and were willing to run the risk, he now proposed the insertion of a clause for that purpose.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons; and to be *printed*, as amended. (No. 237.)

RIVER THAMES (No. 2) BILL.

(*The Lord Mount-Temple.*)

(NO. 218.) THIRD READING.

Order of the Day for the Third Reading read.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª."—(*The Lord Mount-Temple.*)

Lord BRAMWELL said, if the measure passed in its present shape, it would ruin some of the most beautiful residences on the beautiful Thames. Although he had promised not to interfere any further with the progress of the Bill, he had just received such a piteous letter from an old friend, that he felt bound to lay it before their Lordships, and take their opinion upon the Bill. The gentleman to whom he referred, and who signed himself "Your Afflicted Old Friend," begged him to implore the House not to pass the Bill, which, by permitting the mooring of house-boats for so long a period as 48 hours in one spot, would absolutely ruin his "pretty waterside place," and destroy all the pleasure to be derived from his lawn which fronted the river. If a river was navigable, people had the incidental rights which attached to that navigation; and he quite agreed that, if a vessel sprang a leak, or wanted to hoist a sail, those on board would have a right to remain anywhere in the river while they were doing what was necessary for them to enjoy the right of navigation which the law gave them; but that was all the right they had. It was said that, if they moored opposite a gentleman's house or pleasure ground, the riparian proprietor had no remedy. He maintained, on the contrary, that the riparian proprietor had two remedies. He might unmoor the vessel and turn it adrift, just the same as anyone had a right to turn a carriage out of his garden; or he might bring an action at Common Law for damages against the owner. Consequently, there was no necessity for the Bill. The Bill would legalize the mooring of these boats for a period of 48 hours, and he very much deprecated the rights of riparian owners being thus sacrificed. It would give a right which no gentleman or decent person would exercise. In conclusion, he asked their Lordships not to allow the Bill to pass, as, in his judgment, it was absolutely indefensible.

The Marquess of SALISBURY said, the appeal made by so great an authority as the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Bramwell) was so striking an appeal, that it produced in his mind considerable doubt as to whether the Bill ought to be proceeded with. He had not voted against the Bill, because he had hitherto believed that a large majority of the riparian proprietors wished it to pass in its present form; but he confessed that what the noble and learned Lord had said, and what he had recently heard, led him to doubt very much whether that was the case. The noble and learned Lord had earnestly appealed to their Lordships upon the legality of the measure, and he (the Marquess of Salisbury) would suggest whether it would not be better to leave the structure of the Bill as it now appeared, and to insert a Proviso to the effect that nothing in the Bill should be so construed as to deprive the riparian owners of any legal rights which they might now possess. That might be done by the omission of certain words. Whether in that form, or any other, the Bill was passed eventually, the language of the noble and learned Lord made him think it would be far better to pause for a day or two before finally disposing of the measure, in order that his arguments might be fully considered.

Lord MOUNT-TEMPLE said, that, however sound the view expressed by the noble and learned Lord (Lord Bramwell) might be as a matter of law on a certain state of facts, the facts on which he founded that view were certainly wrong. In the Select Committee upon this subject the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Ashbourne), when in the other House, knowing the real facts, came to an entirely different conclusion from that arrived at by the noble and learned Lord in ignorance of those facts. To pass a law that boats should not remain at all opposite to the residences of riparian owners would be to deprive Londoners of one of their most agreeable sources of recreation, without securing to the riparian owners any corresponding benefit. He thought their Lordships ought to pay some attention to the recommendations of the House of Commons Select Committee of which Lord Ashbourne and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach were active Members. Those recommendations were embodied in the present Bill. There was so great a difficulty in taking advantage of the existing law, that he had not heard of any riparian owner who had attempted to put it in force. The riparian owners had sent representatives who had laid their case before the Committee. If the law were effective in the direction suggested by the noble and learned Lord behind him (Lord Bramwell), it would cause serious inconvenience to hundreds and thousands of persons who now spent a week or a month on the river in a house boat. Indeed, he had heard the Bill objected to on the ground that it interfered too much with the rights of the public. The main purpose of the Bill was the regulation of the traffic, and, in order to carry out the object, it proposed to increase the powers now possessed by the Thames Conservancy. Another object of the Bill was to prevent shooting on the river. At this time of the year crowds of people went upon the river with guns and pistols for the purpose of destroying the wild fowl, and frequently the young swans. Such a practice was most dangerous. The other provisions of the measure were intended to enable the police and the magistrates to act with promptitude and with efficiency. Thus, every boat would be required to have a number or badge marked upon it, by which it could be identified and, in case of necessity, stopped at the locks. He trusted that the noble and learned Lord would not intervene at that moment for the purpose of preventing the passing of a measure which had been framed for the mutual interests of the public and of the riparian owners.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord HALSBURY) said, he would point out that the Bill created new rights, and deprived riparian owners of rights they undoubtedly already possessed. He fully concurred in the view expressed by his noble and learned Friend (Lord Bramwell) as to the legal aspect of the question. He had originally been assured that all the riparian owners were in favour of the Bill; but now he understood that there were many against it. The noble Lord opposite (Lord Mount-Temple) had spoken somewhat lightly of the legal opinion of the noble and learned Lord behind him (Lord Bramwell); but all he (the Lord Chancellor) could say was that there was no lawyer in this country who would not assume that opinion to be accurate until the contrary was shown. Therefore, the opinion of the noble and learned Lord was not to be cast aside in the manner the noble Lord proposed. The noble Lord who had moved the third reading of the Bill appeared to altogether mistake the question at issue. Their Lordships were dealing, not with the hundreds and thousands of people who amused themselves on the river, but with the comparatively limited number of persons who thought fit to loiter opposite the houses of riparian owners for, perhaps, three months at a time. Nobody could pretend that this was done in the exercise of the ordinary rights of navigation on the river. In these circumstances, he begged to move that the debate be adjourned until Monday next, in order to give those noble Lords who were opposed to the measure an opportunity of attending and stating their objections to it.

Moved, "That the Debate be adjourned to Monday next."—(*The Lord Chancellor.*)

Motion *agreed to;* Debate further adjourned to Monday next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended on Report. (No. 238.)

LABOURERS (IRELAND (No. 2) BILL.

(*The Marquess of Waterford.*)

(NO. 235.) SECOND READING.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD, in moving that the Bill be now read a second time, said, he would explain its provisions to-morrow, on moving that their Lordships go into Committee upon it.

Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2^{a}."—(*The Marquess of Waterford.*)

THE EARL OF COURTOWN said, he did not at all object to the second reading of the Bill—in fact, he hoped it would be read a second time; but he was of opinion that it would require a good deal of attention in Committee. However much some might object to State interference, he did not believe that even his noble Friend on the Cross Benches (the Earl of Wemyss) would deny that it was essential that agricultural labourers in Ireland should receive assistance from the State by being provided with dwellings. He (the Earl of Courtown) was aware that in England it was considered to be the duty of landlords to provide dwellings for labourers; but he would remind their Lordships that the Land Act had thrown considerable difficulties in the way of

Irish landlords doing so. He was well aware that in some localities in that country the law had been abused by Boards of Guardians for purposes of political vengeance; but he was glad to be able to say, from his own experience, that it had been productive of at least indirect good. He thought it of importance that public attention should be continually fixed on the housing of labourers. In some cases, on the attention of landlords being called to the want of cottages, they had undertaken to erect them; in other cases, where farmers had cabins on their lands which had been declared uninhabitable, they had improved them. The principal defects in the present law which were sought to be remedied by the Bill had relation to its cost. Thus, instead of Boards of Guardians being obliged to purchase land, they could take it on lease; and, instead of an extensive appeal to Parliament, a cheaper appeal was given to the Lord Lieutenant in Council. He believed that good would be done to the labouring classes by the improvement of the law; and, therefore, he hoped the Bill would be passed.

Lord VENTRY said, he agreed with most of what had been said by the noble Earl who had just sat down. He desired to see this new legislation work smoothly, and with that object he proposed to give Notice of Amendments which he would move in Committee designed to prevent unnecessary friction in the working of the measure. He desired as much as anyone to see Irish labourers supplied with better cottages; but their experience of the Act of 1883 might tell them what the effect of this measure would probably be if passed in its present shape. At the same time, he thought the Bill would do a great deal of good if properly amended.

The Earl of MILLTOWN said, he only rose to point out to their Lordships that they were now asked to follow an unusual course of procedure in asking their Lordships to confirm the principle of an important Bill of 23 clauses without having had one word of explanation of its objects from his noble Friend who was in charge of it (the Marquess of Waterford).

Motion *agreed to;* Bill read 2ª accordingly, and *committed* to a Committee of the Whole House *To-morrow.*

EXPIRING LAWS CONTINUANCE BILL.

(*The Earl of Iddesleigh.*)

(NO. 229.) THIRD READING.

Bill read 3ª (according to Order).

On Motion, "That the Bill do pass?"

Lord DENMAN moved to introduce a clause for the purpose of conferring the franchise upon women.

Amendment *moved,*

After Clause 2, add the following Clause:—"Provided that the Act 35 & 36 Vict. c. 33, continued as aforesaid, shall be hereby extended so as to admit all women not legally disqualified who have the same qualification as the present electors for counties and boroughs to vote for the election of Members of Parliament for counties and boroughs."—(*The Lord Denman.*)

The LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord Halsbury) said, that they were engaged at present on an Expiring Laws Continuance Bill; and how could they, in connection with such a measure, enter upon new legislation? What the noble Lord proposed was new legislation.

Amendment *negatived.*

Bill *passed.*

House adjourned at half past Six o'clock,
till To-morrow, a quarter past
Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Thursday, 6th August, 1885.

MINUTES.] — Resolution in Committee — East India (Revenue Accounts).

Public Bill—*Considered as amended*—Criminal Law Amendment [257].

QUESTIONS.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND) — A RURAL LETTER CARRIER, CO. CAVAN.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Postmaster General, Whether Andrew Norris, rural letter carrier for the Shercock and Knappa District of county Cavan, absented himself from his duties on the 13th July; and, if so, did he have leave of absence from his postmaster?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord JOHN MANNERS): I am informed that on the 13th of July the letter carrier in question was absent on leave.

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—THE "PENJDEH INCIDENT."

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether, before Parliament separates, Her Majesty's Government can, without injury to the public interests, give the House any information regarding the arbitration in respect of the collision near Penjdeh, and say whether the arbitration is going on, or whether it is postponed till the boundary is settled, or for any other reason; who is the arbitrator; and, whether the terms of reference have been settled?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am afraid I am not in a position to give the hon. Member any information on this subject, and it is not likely that I can before Parliament separates. Some delay has taken place in bringing together the facts necessary for drawing up the reference; and at the present time it would not be possible to carry the matter further.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL presumed that the right hon. Gentleman had not departed from the policy of the late Government in regard to the proposal for arbitration. ["Order!"]

EGYPT—THE SOUDAN—THE EXPEDITIONS TO SUAKIN.

SIR HENRY TYLER asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he can state, in round numbers, what has been the cost to the Country in money of the various Military expeditions to Suakin, especially of the first and second expeditions of General Sir Gerald Graham; and, also, what total expenditure has been incurred on account of the Suakin-Berber Railway, dividing that expenditure between cost of permanent way; cost of equipment, including rolling stock; cost of other materials or plant; cost of superintendence and labour; payments to agents or contractors?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): Some time must elapse before all the accounts, especially those relating to the Indian troops, are received at the War Office. At present, therefore, I am not in a position to make a statement of the cost incurred consequent on the Suakin Expeditions. For the same reason I cannot give the information desired by my hon. Friend in regard to the Suakin-Berber Railway.

AGRICULTURAL HOLDINGS (ENGLAND)—THE BETHELL CHARITY TRUSTEES OF NEWARK AND MR R. ROBINSON.

MR. WARTON (for Mr. COMPTON LAWRANCE) asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether his attention has been called to the case of Mr. Richard Robinson, a tenant under the Bethell Charity Trustees of Newark, of a farm at Laughton, near Falkingham Lines, under a lease of 21 years from April, 1879, at £160 per annum; whether he is aware that, upon an application made to the Trustees for a reduction of rent, the matter was referred to the Charity Commissioners, and a valuer was sent over at the expense of Mr. Robinson, upon the understanding that he was to abide by the valuation; whether he is aware that the rentable value of the farm was estimated at £90 per annum, and that the valuer expressed a doubt whether a new tenant could be found to give more than £65 per annum for the remainder of the lease; whether he is aware that, notwithstanding such report, the Charity Commissioners have refused to adopt it; and, whether Mr. R. Robinson has any remedy?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Mr. E. STANHOPE): Mr. Robinson, who is a tenant under lease of the Bethell Charity Trustees, applied for a reduction of rent at the rate of 25 per cent. The application having been referred to the Charity Commission, they required, in accordance with the usual practice, the Report of a surveyor upon the proposal, Mr. Robinson bearing the cost. But they gave no pledge as to the course they would adopt on receiving the Report. The surveyor, besides considering the matter referred to him, proceeded to express an opinion on the value of the farm. After receiving the Report the Commissioners acceded to Mr. Robinson's request for a reduction of rent, but for one year only, adding that they would consider future proposals as they arose. The dealings of the Commission have not been with

Mr. Robinson, but with the Trustees of the Charity, as in all similar cases. Mr. Robinson's only remedy would appear to be that to which all tenants under lease may ordinarily have recourse in such cases.

POST OFFICE—MAILS TO THE WESTERN ISLANDS.

Lord COLIN CAMPBELL asked the Secretary to the Treasury, Whether it has been decided to give additional grants for the purpose of defraying the cost of new arrangements for accelerating the Mails to the Western Islands; and, if so, whether the Treasury will authorise the Postmaster General to make such arrangements without delay?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Sir Henry Holland): It has been decided to make a very considerable addition to the present cost of the Mail Service to the Southern Hebrides; and a letter goes this day from the Treasury to the Postmaster General, which should enable him to settle the matter at an early date.

EGYPT—THE ALEXANDRIA INDEMNITY AWARDS.

Mr. GOURLEY asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If he will be good enough to inform the House what steps he intends adopting for the immediate distribution of the Alexandria Indemnity Awards?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Bourke): The payment of the Indemnity Awards will be made in accordance with Article X. of the Convention of March 18 last, and Article IX. of the Khedivial Decree of the 27th ultimo. The Commissioners of the Debt, who are charged under the Convention and Decree with the payment of the Indemnities, have informed the Egyptian Government that they propose to proceed to Alexandria for the purpose of distributing the awards, and in order to be in direct communication with the Consuls of the different Powers, as soon as they are in possession of the necessary funds. It is proposed that the subjects of each Power be paid separately, an official of the Consulate being present. The Commissioners further propose to publish at Alexandria the date and place of payment.

NAVY—THE EVOLUTIONARY SQUADRON.

Mr. GOURLEY asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, If it be correct that, as a result of the recent manœuvres of the Evolutionary Squadron, three of the largest coastguard reserve ships have been condemned as unfit for further sea service; if so, for what employment he intends adapting them?

The FIRST LORD (Lord George Hamilton): It is not correct that as a result of the recent manœuvres of the Evolutionary Squadron three of the largest Coastguard reserve ships have been condemned as unfit for further sea service. It has, however, been arranged to pay off four of the ships which have hitherto performed the duties of Coastguard reserve ships—namely, the *Lord Warden*, *Valiant*, *Repulse*, and *Defence*, and their officers and crews will be turned over to more powerful iron-clads. The above-mentioned four ships will probably be employed to replace harbour ships, and will not be considered as efficient sea-going iron-clads.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) —REVISION COURTS, CO. CAVAN.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Is he aware that there is no place fixed for holding a Revision Court in county Cavan further north than Ballyconnell, which is twenty-four miles distant from some parts of the district; and, whether he will arrange for an additional Revision Court to accommodate the northern part of the county?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): This matter is under consideration, and I think I can promise the hon. Member that a Revision Court will be appointed at some convenient place in the Northern part of West Cavan, probably at Swanlinbar or Blacklion.

LUNATICS (IRELAND)—ARMAGH LUNATIC ASYLUM.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What is the number of patients in Armagh Lunatic Asylum; how many of these are Catholic, how many Protestant, and how many Presbyterian; what is the number of governors who constitute the Board of the Armagh Asylum; how many of these are Catholic, how many Protestant, and how many Presbyterian; how many Catholic and how many Presbyterian clergymen are members of the Board; what are the present salaries of the Catholic, Protestant, and Presbyterian chaplains respectively; what were their respective salaries before April 1885; and, why were the salaries then changed?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): The number of patients in this Asylum is 264. Of these, 79 are Protestants, 39 Presbyterians, 138 Roman Catholics, and eight of other persuasions. The Board consists of 13 Protestants, four Presbyterians, three Roman Catholics, one member of the Society of Friends, and one Methodist. There are two Presbyterian clergymen Governors, and I believe the Roman Catholic Archbishop is also a Governor. Each of the chaplains receives a salary of £30. These salaries were not changed in April last, but a proposal to increase them is at present before the Government.

FISHERIES (IRELAND)—THE FOYLE AND THE BANN.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Have the Fishery Inspectors investigated the complaints made by the fishermen off the Rivers Foyle and Bann; have the Inspectors made any Report on the inquiries made in the spring of this year at Moville, and in the winter at Portrush; and, if so, has any decision been made thereon, or will any decision be made, so as to protect the poor fishermen in their lawful avocations from such depredations as the steamer causes by sailing among the fleet of fishing boats, and destroying their nets; whether, considering the inability of these people to pay for Law, he will direct the captains and owners of the steamer, and all the parties concerned, to be prosecuted for thus obstructing fishermen, and also to recover damages for the losses already sustained by the fishermen; and, will he give Copy of Inspectors' Report?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): The Inspectors have held two inquiries into this matter. Their Report and two volumes of evidence reached me yesterday. I have only had time to observe that some of the complaints of the fishermen were proved, and that many of them were found to be groundless; and also that the Inspectors are not unanimous in all their recommendations. The matter requires careful consideration, and I can only promise the hon. Member that it shall receive it.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) —PUBLICATION OF LISTS, CO. SLIGO.

Mr. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with regard to the fact that the lists of voters, which should have been published, as by Law required, on the 22nd ult., had not been published in the Grange District (county Sligo), on the 1st inst., Whether it is the fact that Major Wynne, the Clerk of the Peace for county Sligo, was at the late assizes fined by Chief Justice Morris £20 for absence from Court when duty required him there, and £20 additional for every two hours during which his absence might continue; what was the total to which the fine amonnted; has it been levied; if not, for what reason; whether the delay in publishing the lists of voters has arisen from Major Wynne's neglect of his duties and absence from his office; and, if so, why he has been constantly absent from his office; whether he will be visited with the prescribed penalties; and, will the Government cause him to be informed that his retention of his office will depend upon his personal attention to his duties, and that such attention is indispensable during the period of preparation for the work of the Revision Court?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): The Clerk of the Peace telegraphed to the Under Secretary on the 21st of last March to say that the printer could not finish the lists by the 22nd, although they had been given to him in good time. We have asked for further explanations of this matter. I understand it is the fact that this Clerk of the Peace was fined as stated in the Question; but I am also informed that subsequently during the Assizes the learned Judge voluntarily remitted the fine.

POST OFFICE—CONTRACTS—THE IRISH MAILS.

Mr. SEXTON asked the Postmaster General, Whether he has arranged with the Midland Railway Company of Ireland for the service of mails at forty miles an hours between Dublin and the West of Ireland, as desired by the Memorial of Members of the House of Commons, presented to his Predecessor on the 15th of December last?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord JOHN MANNERS): In answer to a former Question of the hon. Member I stated that the payment of 1*s*. 6*d*. per mile asked by the Midland and Great Western Railway Company was too high for the Post Office to grant. I am now happy to say the Company have made a sensible abatement in their demand; and their new proposal for an improved service at the speed mentioned in the Question between Dublin and the West of Ireland, including Westport and Ballina, is now under the consideration of the Government.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) —REVISION COURTS, TYRONE AND DONEGAL.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, for the convenience and at the wish of large bodies of claimants and voters in Tyrone, the Irish Government will arrange that Castlederg and Strabane be made additional Revision Courts for North Tyrone, and Pomeroy an additional Court for East Tyrone, and that, for the accommodation of the barony of Lower Strabane, left without a Court by the existing arrangement, Gortin be selected for the sitting of the Court instead of Sixmilecross; and, whether, in order to moderate the hardship of the arrangement by which Courts for South Donegal are to be held only at Donegal and Ballyshannon, imposing a journey of about fifty miles on voters and claimants in the mountainous districts of the Division, the Government will arrange that a Court shall be held in Killybegs or Carrick?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): Strabane is already a Revision Court for North Tyrone, and Castlederg will be made one. Cookstown has been made the Court for East Tyrone. Pomeroy is within a few miles of Dungannon, with which it is connected by rail, and the district is itself too small for a separate Court. The question of substituting Gortin for Sixmilecross, and of making Killybegs an additional Court for South Donegal will be favourably considered.

POST OFFICE—SUPERINTENDENTS OF SORTING OFFICES.

MR. SEXTON (for Mr. DWYER GRAY), asked the noble Lord the Postmaster General, Whether it is the fact that the maximum salaries of Superintendents of Sorting and Telegraph Branches are similar in all English cities and towns where such officials are on the establishment, whilst the salaries of the Superintendents of the Sorting Offices in Edinburgh and Dublin are fixed at £200 per annum more than those of the Superintendents of the Telegraph Department at these offices, notwithstanding that the latter are responsible for the administration of their respective offices throughout the entire twenty-four hours, whilst the former are only responsible for their period of duty, which generally consists of five hours per day, and that the Telegraph Superintendents have much larger staffs of subordinates to control and supervise than those of the Sorting Branches; whether it is a fact that superintendence of the Sorting Office in Dublin is performed by two officials with maximum salaries of £500 each per annum, whilst the superintending work of the Telegraph Department in that office must be performed by one man, whose maximum salary is only £300 per annum, and who, in addition to an ability to administer the ordinary routine of official work (the only essential requisite for superintending the Sorting Office) must have a large knowledge of electrical science, which knowledge can only be obtained by a long-continued course of private study; whether it is a fact that the sorting office "clerks" enjoy maximum salaries considerably in excess of the "clerks" of the Telegraph Department in both Edinburgh and Dublin, although the latter perform eight hours duty per week more than the former; and, whether he will investigate these matters with a view to having the two departments placed on a footing of equality in both Dublin and Edinburgh? His hon. Friend had asked him to say that the figures should be £150, instead of £200, and £450, instead of £500.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord JOHN MANNERS): While admitting that the statements of the hon. Member relating to the rates of salary are correct, I should hardly be justified in taking up the time of the House with the full explanation which an answer to all the suggestions and inferences of the hon. Member would require. I may, however, say that the circumstances to which he refers shall receive attention.

ARMY—THE 2ND EAST SURREY REGIMENT.

Mr. FRANCIS BUXTON asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether it is the case that the 2nd East Surrey Regiment (late 70th), was quartered in India from 1871 until September 1884, and in that period took part in active service in Afghanistan; that it was ordered to Egypt for active service on leaving India in 1884, and has been there ever since; that it has now received orders for a further campaign on the Nile during this Autumn, although hopes have been held out to the men that they should return home immediately; whether, during this period of fourteen years, the Officers or the men have been allowed to return home on leave; and, when the regiment will return home?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith): With regard to the past service of this battalion in India and Egypt the facts are as stated in the Question; but, as regards the future, the battalion certainly has not received orders for a further campaign on the Nile. During its absence from home officers and men have had the usual leave; but I may remark that men serving in India do not come home on furlough, and it should be added that though the battalion has been 14 years abroad the very large majority of the men have, under the system of short service, been out but a few years. As I stated on the 3rd instant, the battalion will be among the first to come home as soon as the garrison of Egypt can be reduced.

EGYPT (THE SOUDAN)—SUPPLIES FOR THE TROOPS AT SUAKIN.

Colonel KING-HARMAN asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether any steps can be taken to ensure a better supply of milk and vegetables to the regimental bazaars of the Sikh and Bengal Regiments now serving at Suakin?

Lord John Manners

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith): No Report has been received to the effect that the Indian regimental bazaar arrangements are unsatisfactory; but the question is necessarily a local one, and the General Officer commanding at Suakin, who is an experienced Indian officer, has full authority to make any arrangements he may consider requisite.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND—EXCOMMUNICATION AT SAHAM TONEY.

Mr. PICTON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether it is a fact that, as reported in *The Thetford Times*, and several London papers of later date, the Reverend Coker Adams, Rector of Saham Toney, did, on Sunday July 26th, pronounce in his parish church a sentence of excommunication against Mr. Joseph Payne, a parishioner, aged 82; whether the reason alleged by the Reverend Coker Adams for the sentence of excommunication was Mr. Payne's "persistent neglect of the Church's ordinances and refusal of her ministrations;" whether the Reverend Coker Adams was acting in this case by the instruction of any higher ecclesiastical authority; or, if not, whether he was acting ultra vires; and, if so, whether any notice will be taken of his illegal action; whether the sentence of excommunication carries with it any secular consequences, and whether every one who declines to attend his parish church is legally liable to have a sentence of excommunication publicly pronounced against him; and, whether the action of the Reverend Coker Adams has the approval of his bishop?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross): I can only say that I saw this announcement with the deepest surprise and regret. I know nothing of the facts; but I thought it right that the sentence should be sent to the Bishop, who, I have no doubt, will make inquiry into the matter.

POST OFFICE (SCOTLAND)—TELEGRAPH OFFICE CLERKS.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Postmaster General, If it be a fact that in English and Scotch telegraph offices all clerks performing night duty are allowed three weeks holidays in the year, while over forty telegraph clerks in Belfast, some having 15 years' service, who perform exactly the same duty as those in English and Scotch offices, are allowed only two weeks; is it not acknowledged as a rule in the service that clerks who perform night work (which is reckoned unhealthy duty) should have compensating holidays, and that the clerks in Edinburgh, Glasgow, Liverpool, Leeds, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Cork, Birmingham, Bristol, Hull, Leicester, Sheffield, &c. are on this account allowed three weeks holidays annually, while the night operators in Belfast are given but two weeks; and, if the facts be as stated, will he cause the grievances of the Belfast clerks to be removed, by ordering that the same allowances in this and other respects be given in Belfast as are given in offices where like work is performed?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord John Manners): In reply to the hon. Member, I have to state that, in the matter of leave of absence, the telegraphists at Belfast are treated in exactly the same manner as those at other Offices. There is but one rule applicable to all.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—EXTRA POLICE, LIMERICK.

Mr. LEWIS asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Limerick Corporation is still a heavy debtor to the Treasury in respect of charges for extra police; whether other Corporations have not recently refused to pay for extra police until the liability is equally and impartially enforced; and, what steps the Government proposes to take impartially to recover the money due to the Government?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): A charge extending over three years is due for extra police by the Limerick Corporation. No other Corporations have refused to pay for extra police. The matter is at present engaging the attention of the Lord Lieutenant.

ARMY—QUARTERMASTERS AND RIDING MASTERS — PROMOTION.

Mr. CAUSTON asked the Secretary of State for War, If he will take into consideration, at an early date, the claims of the Army Quartermasters and Riding Masters for a reduction in the period (ten years) those Officers are now obliged to serve as Commissioned Officers before they can obtain the honorary and relative rank of Captain, taking into account their previous long service in the ranks, their age when Commissioned, which, with very few exceptions, debars them from any advantage under Article 6 of the Royal Warrant of 1884, and the fact that the average service of the Senior Lieutenants of Regiments, with whom they rank, is less than seven years?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith): I would remind the hon. Member that considerable privileges were conceded in the way of rank to this class of officers so recently as 1881, and that their case was fully considered by my Predecessor, who decided that more could not be done for them. I am not prepared to depart from that decision. As regards Article 6 of the Royal Warrant, promotion to the rank of Lieutenant would be a doubtful advantage to a Quartermaster unless he had attained that rank much earlier than is usually the case. I may remark that the average service of the senior Lieutenants is nearer nine years than seven, as stated in the Question.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES) — THE NORTHAMPTON VOLUNTEERS.

Lord BURGHLEY asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether he would permit the formation of a company of Volunteers at Oundle, in Northamptonshire, considering that eighty-eight men came forward and put down their names, £380 was collected, officers nominated, and the other requirements of the War Office complied with as far back as the winter of 1884?

Sir ARTHUR HAYTER said, as this Question reflected upon him as the adviser of the late Secretary of State, he wished to ask the right hon. Gentleman whether he was aware that the establishment of the Northamptonshire Rifles was 1,308; that they were 214 short of their establishment; and that only 894 were present at inspection; and whether, under these circumstances, he would sanction the regiment having 13 companies, a most inconvenient number, the present number being 12?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. W. H. Smith), in reply, said, he had not been favoured by the hon. Baronet with the information in his Question, and he was not able to reply in detail; but probably the answer he was about to give would be sufficient. The 1st Northamptonshire Rifle Volunteers, to which the proposed company at Oundle would belong, was already an unusually large corps; and strong reason would have to be shown for adding to it. The establishments for 1885-6 were fixed; but if it was still desired to raise this company for 1886-7, application should be made in September through the military authorities of the district.

ARMY (ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT)—WOOLWICH ARSENAL.

Mr. BOORD asked the Surveyor General of Ordnance, Whether he will state the number of hands employed at the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, and the number of Medical Officers appointed to the charge of them; whether it is true that patients frequently have to wait many hours at the Dispensary before they can be seen by the doctor; and, if he can say how many cases on an average each Medical Officer has to attend to daily?

The SURVEYOR GENERAL (Mr. Guy Dawnay): The number of hands employed in the Royal Arsenal, Woolwich, is at present 11,200. Three medical officers have charge of them, the third having been recently added. It is not the case that patients have to wait many hours before they can be seen. New cases are attended to immediately; but chronic cases on the sick list have to take their turn. Their time of waiting rarely exceeds an hour. The daily cases to be attended to average 380, of which about 50 are seen by private practitioners, leaving 110 for each Army medical officer at the Arsenal.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS—THE CHARITY COMMISSIONERS—SIR ANDREW JUDD'S SCHOOL, TONBRIDGE.

Mr. CAUSTON asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether the Charity Commissioners, after inquiry in 1869 about Sir Andrew Judd's School, suggested that a second grade or middle school should be established at the town of Tonbridge; whether, in consequence of that suggestion, the Skinners' Company offered (if the Commissioners would sanction the use of £10,000, part of Hunt and Attwell loan trust funds, for the purpose, which were not required for loans) a sum of £10,000 out of their own moneys; whether such two sums of £10,000, making a total of £20,000, were accepted on the above terms by the Commissioners, and made the capital of the new middle school for the town of Tonbridge; whether the word parish was substituted for town in the published scheme, and not objected to by the Company, for reasons stated in a letter sent by the Company to the Commissioners in December 1877, viz. because the Company thought that if the position of the school was not rigidly fixed in the scheme they would be able to make better terms in acquiring a site; whether it is not well known that the Skinners' Company have all along wished to benefit the town of Tonbridge by the establishment of the new middle school there; and also, that the inhabitants of Tonbridge, who wished to secure privileges (when the scheme for Sir Andrew Judd's School was under consideration), abstained from interfering because they were informed that the Skinners' Company had arranged with the Commissioners (in 1877) to found a new middle school at or near the town of Tonbridge; and, whether the Skinners' Company has been compelled by the Charity Commissioners, against its wish repeatedly expressed, to accept a site at Tunbridge Wells inferior to one offered by the inhabitants of Tonbridge, and approved by the Charity Commissioners as suitable?

The VICE PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL (Mr. E. Stanhope): The Charity Commissioners were not concerned with the question of a scheme for Sir Andrew Judd's School until after the passing of the Endowed Schools Act, 1874. Their draft scheme of 1875 proposed to provide for the ultimate establishment of a middle school "in or near the town of Tonbridge." The offer of £20,000—in all—from the Skinners' Company was accepted by the Charity Commissioners on the terms of a draft scheme which was communicated to the Skinners' Company on the 19th July, 1877, when the Commissioners, referring to the words "in or near the parish of Tonbridge," stated as follows:—

> "On Clause 8 of this scheme arises the important question where the new school is to be

placed, whether at Tonbridge itself or at Tunbridge Wells, Southborough, or elsewhere. The Commissioners think the scheme ought before publication to be made less vague on this point than it is in the present draft; but they would be glad to have the benefit of the opinion of the Company."

In reply, on the 21st December, 1877, the Company stated that—

> "They are strongly of opinion that it is desirable to adhere to the clause in the form proposed by the Commissioners for the following reasons. They would, in all probability, be able to make better terms in the purchase of a site if its position is not rigidly fixed. They are not at present decided whether it would be desirable that the school should be at Tonbridge, at Tunbridge Wells, or elsewhere, and do not feel that they are likely to come to a conclusion without taking into account the relative eligibility of sites which may be offered, and other questions. . . . They, therefore, express an earnest hope that the position of the school may be left for further consideration, and for settlement under Clause 9 of the scheme when it comes into operation."

In view of the foregoing statements on the part of the Skinners' Company the Commissioners are not able to accept the allegations contained in the fifth paragraph of the Question. Acting under the powers of the scheme, the Charity Commissioners declined to approve a site proposed by the Company at Tonbridge, but have approved one since proposed at Tunbridge Wells. In arriving at this decision the Commissioners have acted upon the wider consideration of the requirements of the respective localities, and not upon the comparative merits of the several sites proposed.

Mr. CAUSTON: I hope I may be allowed to tell the House that last week, during the annual visit to Tonbridge of the Governors to the school, they disapproved of the site they were forced to take from the Charity Commissioners.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS asked whether, seeing that there was a great cause of grievance on the part of the inhabitants of Tonbridge, and that they had petitioned the House on the subject, the right hon. Gentleman would consent to delay the application of the endowment until an inquiry had been made?

The VICE PRESIDENT said, that as the Charity Commissioners had arrived at their decision after careful inquiry, and after hearing all the parties concerned, he could not undertake further to delay this scheme.

PUBLIC HEALTH—THE RIVER THAMES—PURIFICATION OF SEWAGE.

Mr. BORLASE asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he can give the House any information relative to the success or otherwise of the experiments which have now for some considerable time been carried on at considerable cost at Crossness with a view to the purification of the sewage of the Thames?

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. Balfour), in reply, said that he had no information to give on the subject; but the Question might be repeated by the hon. Member.

SOUTH AFRICA—THE BOERS—ATTACK ON MR. J. DONALDSON.

Sir FREDERICK MILNER, who had the following Question on the Paper:—To ask the Secretary of State for the Colonies, If his attention has been called to the brutal treatment by the Boers of Mr. James Donaldson, agent of the Transvaal Syndicate, Limited, an English subject, at Farm California, who was set upon by five Boers, viz. Mr. Viljorn and two sons, Messrs. U. E. Breitenback, and S. P. Schultze, and most brutally beaten, for attempting to enter a hut belonging to the Company, of which he was in possession; if he will cause inquiries to be instituted, and reparation to be made; and, if he is aware that this is only one of many outrages that have been perpetrated by the Boers on British subjects in the Transvaal? said, he had received a communication that the matter would be inquired into, and therefore he should not put the Question.

PUBLIC HEALTH—THE CHOLERA.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked the President of the Local Government Board, What steps he has taken to call the serious attention of the local authorities in the various seaports and towns of the Country to the terrible outbreak of cholera, not only in Spain but also in France; whether the local authorities as well as the Local Government Board are taking efficient means to prevent its introduction into this Country; and, whether any steps can be taken to improve the disgraceful state of Covent Garden Market?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR): The action of the Board may be shortly summarized. We have urged upon the several Local Authorities in England and Wales the importance of their taking such measures of precaution against cholera as the sanitary condition of their district may demand, and we have supplied them with a Memorandum by the Medical Officer of the Board on the subject. We have prohibited the importation of rags from Spain; and if there is any serious spread of cholera in France, an Order will also be issued as regards rags from that country. The Regulations in force last year during the prevalence of cholera in France and Italy, for dealing with cases of cholera which may reach our ports, are still in force. We have strengthened temporarily the staff of Medical Inspectors for the purpose of inquiring as to the sanitary condition of the ports and other districts which there is reason to suppose would be most likely to suffer from cholera in the event of its introduction to England; and I am advised that, on the whole, there is reason for satisfaction with the action in preparation for cholera by the various Sanitary Authorities on the coast. The Managers of the Metropolitan Asylum District have obtained the services of a medical man, who has had large experience as a Medical Officer of Health in the Metropolis, with the view of his assisting them in maturing the arrangements as to a first line of defence, in the way of hospital provision, which would be necessary in London in the event of an outbreak of cholera. It must, however, be recollected that while I am anxious to do everything in my power to aid the Local Authorities in fulfilling their duties, the responsibility for providing against the advent of cholera and of dealing with it, should it reach our shores, rests, and must rest, with them.

MR. BRODRICK: Might I ask my right hon. Friend, with reference to Covent Garden whether he will make a personal inspection of the market at the time when it is most offensive—namely, between 5 and 6 o'clock in the morning.

[No reply.]

Sir Walter B. Barttelot

MEDICAL RELIEF DISQUALIFICATION REMOVAL BILL—THE SUPPLEMENTARY LISTS.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he will issue instructions to the overseers respecting the preparation of the supplementary list of voters, as required by the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Bill?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR): It is not our intention to issue instructions to overseers respecting the preparation of the supplemental lists required by the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Bill. This Bill, which now awaits the Royal Assent, provides that the Clerks of the Peace and Town Clerks shall forthwith, after the passing of the Act, issue precepts to the overseers informing them of their duties under it; and I understand that the Home Office will, as soon as the Bill has passed, communicate with the Clerks of the Peace and Town Clerks on the subject.

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE — LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) BILL.

MR. BRODRICK asked, Whether the Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill would be proceeded with to-morrow; and if the Chancellor of the Exchequer would aid him in obtaining the sense of the House on the Motion for going into Committee on the Police Enfranchisement Bill?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he should be very glad if the sense of the House could be expressed upon the Police Enfranchisement Bill. The Government would endeavour to afford facilities in that direction if possible. The Committee on the Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill would follow the Housing of the Working Classes (England) Bill, which stood for second reading after the Criminal Law Amendment Bill, Report. If those were disposed of, then the Committee on the Land Bill would stand first for to-morrow.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON: If the Criminal Law Amendment Bill is not taken to-night, will it be the first Order to-morrow?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Of course, what I said was under the impression that the Criminal Law Amendment Bill would be finished to-night.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON: Suppose it is not finished?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I hope there will be no difficulty.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY.

MR. BROADHURST asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he could give the House the names of the labour Representatives on the Royal Commission on the Depression in Trade, or, at least, the proportion they would bear to the Representatives of capital?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: No, Sir; I am not able to answer that Question. Perhaps, however, it may be convenient to the House that I should state that my noble Friend (the Earl of Iddesleigh), who has charge of the matter, will make a statement on Monday or Tuesday in "another place" on the subject.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, it would be a great convenience to the House if the Chancellor of the Exchequer would state on what day he would take noncontentious matter.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am afraid I am not able to answer that Question.

MR. A. R. D. ELLIOT asked what course the Government intended to take in regard to the Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) Bill? It had already passed the House of Lords.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I have not heard of the Bill before; and therefore I do not know anything of its prospects.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): Perhaps I may be allowed to answer the Question. This Bill which my right hon. Friend has not heard of—and it is not in the least to be wondered at—is a Bill of very great importance; but my hon. Friend (Mr. A. R. D. Elliot) is perfectly right; the Bill is so long and complicated that it would be absolutely impossible to proceed with it this Session.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

——o——

INDIA—EAST INDIA (REVENUE ACCOUNTS)—THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL STATEMENT.

COMMITTEE.

EAST INDIA (REVENUE ACCOUNTS) *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL), in rising to move the following Resolution:—

> "That it appears, by the Accounts laid before this House, that the Total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1884 was £71,727,421, including £13,240,507 received from Productive Public Works; that the Total Expenditure in India and in England was £70,339,925, including £12,032,754 spent on Productive Public Works (Revenue Account); that there was an excess of Revenue over Expenditure in that year of £1,387,496; and that the Capital Expenditure on Productive Public Works in the same year was £3,992,029, including a Charge of £566,261 incurred in the redemption of previously existing liabilities."

said: Sir Arthur Otway, it has been thought more convenient by the authorities of the House that we should this year revert to the practice which had always been maintained for many years up to 1876—namely, of making the Indian Financial Statement when the House is in Committee. That practice was departed from on account of the custom which grew up among hon. Members interested in Indian affairs, of putting down Motions relating to India, which deferred the Statement of the Minister sometimes to a very late hour. But, no Amendments having been put down on the present occasion owing to the forbearance of hon. Members, I have gone back to what is the more ancient, and, I think, the more Constitutional custom.

In making the Statement which it is my duty to make, and which will be of some length, I appeal to the indulgence of the Committee, because, as the Committee well knows, the question of Indian finance is a very large one, a very complicated, and a very difficult one. To understand it thoroughly would require the assiduous attention of many years, and the Committee is aware that I have not had more than about six weeks, at the outside, in which to acquaint myself with the financial circumstances of the year, and that during those six weeks my attention has had to be given to other questions besides those of Indian finance. Therefore, on that ground, I would ask for the indulgence of the Committee. But, Sir, there is another ground on which even a Minister of large experience might make a special request of that character to-night. In ordinary times, the Secretary of State, so far as he confines his remarks to finance, merely re-echoes, and, more or less, repeats mechanically, the Statement which has been made in the previous month of March by the Finance Minister in India. But on the present occasion I am unable to take that course, and, in many respects, what I have to put before the Committee is practically a new and hitherto an untold story of Indian finance. I have to-day placed in the Vote Office, for the convenience of hon. Members, a Paper which will assist hon. Members in following the figures with which I have now to trouble the Committee.

Sir Arthur Otway, the Financial Statement usually laid before the House of Commons embraces, as the Committee is aware, the figures for a period of three years. It generally deals with the closed Accounts of two years ago, with the Revised Estimates of the preceding year, and with the Budget Estimate of the current year. I propose to follow that practice in the remarks which I now make, and to refer to the closed Accounts of 1883-4, to the Revised Estimates for 1884-5, and to the Budget Estimate for 1885-6.

On the closed Accounts of the year 1883-4 the formal Estimate which I submit to the Committee is moved. The Committee will find that the Accounts for 1883-4, which have now been finally closed, show a Revenue of £71,727,000, and an Expenditure of £70,340,000. In other words, they show a surplus of Revenue over Expenditure of £1,387,000.

The Revised Estimates for 1884-5 show a Revenue of £69,992,000, and an Expenditure of £70,702,000; in other words, a deficit of £710,000, in place of the surplus of £319,000 which was estimated in the Budget of that year. The result, therefore, of the Revised Estimate for 1884-5 is worse than the Budget Estimate by £1,029,000, the Expenditure being greater by £461,000, and the Revenue less by £568,000. There can be no doubt that the chief cause of that falling-off has been the great depression in trade, which has affected India as well as the other countries of the world, and especially the low price of wheat and the diminished rice trade from British Burmah, which alone produced a falling off in the Customs Duties to the extent of £260,000. The general depression of trade, and the low price of wheat, also affected the railway receipts very materially; there had been a falling-off in that matter from the Budget Estimates of no less than £755,000. There was also a temporary falling-off in the Land Revenue of £342,000. On the other hand, the improved price of the Excise was better by £217,000; the irrigation receipts improved upon the Budget Estimate by £116,000; and other sources of revenue not anticipated in the Budget Estimate of the year produced £200,000. As to the Expenditure of the year, I may point out that the opium crop was, on the whole, disadvantageous as a matter of finance; the produce was abnormally large; and, therefore, the payments and the cost of manufacture exceeded the Budget Estimate by the very large sum of £593,000. The political charges of the year were increased by £167,000, mainly owing to the expenses of the Boundary Commission; the interest on Debt increased by £242,000, including £184,000 for discount on the £3,000,000 Loan at 3 per cent raised in London last year. I will ask the Committee to bear that figure in mind—£184,000 for discount on the Loan of £3,000,000 3 per cent Stock. On the other hand, the Army charges were reduced by £126,000; the charges for exchange were less by £285,000, and the working expenses of railways were £139,000 less.

Now I come to the Budget of the current year as presented by the Government of India in March last. I put this before the Committee to make my Statement complete, though I do not think it will be of material value in this discussion. In March last Sir Auckland Colvin estimated the Revenue for 1885-6 at £72,090,000, and the Expenditure at £71,582,000. In other words, he anticipated a surplus of £508,000. He placed the Revenue higher than the

Estimate for 1884-5 by £2,098,000. That is to say, going into details, he placed the Land Revenue at £788,000 higher, and the railways £929,000 higher. The opium receipts, owing to the large crop of the preceding year, he estimated at £176,000 higher than the year before. He also estimated that the improvement of the rice trade in British Burmah would increase the Customs receipts by £145,000; while the improved trade in salt, aided by an improvement in Stamps, Excise, provincial rates, and forest duties, would cause an increase of £304,000. The receipts under the head of irrigation were placed at £167,000 less. Turning to the expenditure, we find that it was £880,000 higher than the Estimate for 1884-5. That was, in some degree, owing to the working expenses and interest on railways having been placed at £598,000 higher than the previous year, besides £169,000 more than in the previous year being taken out of Revenue for the construction of railways, in addition to the money which might be borrowed for that purpose. There was also an increase in the estimated charge for Law and Justice, which was higher by £146,000 than the Estimate for 1884-5, owing to the extension of the Judicial Staff in several Provinces. Education was £81,000 in excess of the previous year; collection of Land Revenue higher by £98,000, and the charge for military works higher by £116,000, which is chiefly to be accounted for by the expenditure which became necessary for the defence of Aden and Bombay. There was also provision in the Budget for a charge for payment to the Commission for Reduction of Debt of £360,000 in excess of the previous year. The loss by exchange upon the loan of £3,000,000 was fixed by Sir Auckland Colvin at £321,000 higher, owing to the fact that the rupee was taken at the value of 1*s.* 7*d.*, instead of 1*s.* 7½*d.*, the rate of exchange taken in the previous year. But, on the other hand, Sir Auckland Colvin's Estimate placed the interest on ordinary Debt, excluding the charge for public works, at £451,000 less than in the previous year, the opium charges at £458,000 less, and the Army expenditure at £238,000 less than in the previous year. The Budget has, however, been completely knocked on the head, and smashed by peculiar circumstances —I allude to the advance of the Russian troops in Central Asia, and the failure of the Russian Government to carry out what we imagined were their engagements as to the sending of a Commission to meet our Boundary Commission for the purpose of delimitating the Frontier of Afghanistan. The advance of General Komaroff compelled even the late Government to make considerable preparations for war. In this country there was a Vote of Credit of £11,000,000. In India the Viceroy and his Council, acting under the sanction of the Government at home, prepared two Army Corps, necessitating an expenditure on transport, rations, forage, and clothing of no less than £2,600,000. On that item I will merely remark that a very large amount of that sum—perhaps I may put it at almost one-half—together with a considerable loss of life, and an amount of hardship and suffering to man and beast which it is impossible to estimate, would have been saved if the Government of India had been in a position to avail itself of the Quetta Railway, which the late Government in 1880 ordered to be abandoned. It was also necessary to order from England ordnance at a cost of £450,000. There was also an extra subsidy to the Ameer of £250,000, and for the increased rapidity of construction, which became absolutely necessary, of the Scinde-Pishin line, storage of railway material, and construction of temporary line from Quetta to the head of the Bolan Pass, an expenditure of £1,180,000, of which £700,000 was, I regret to say, drawn from borrowed money intended for other works of great importance and value, thus, however, reducing the additional charge on the year to £480,000. The total increase of expenditure which the late Government considered to be absolutely and vitally essential on account of military necessities, unforeseen and unprovided for in the Budget of March, thus amounted to £3,780,000. There is also other additional expenditure which Sir Auckland Colvin places in respect of opium charges, owing to the opium crop having proved unexpectedly as abnormally bountiful as last year, which throws an additional sum of £600,000 on the Revenue; the discount on the £3,000,000 loan recently raised in England the other day, amounted to £508,000, and there was also a charge of £75,000 in respect of the telegraph cable in the Persian Gulf. The total expenditure not provided for in Sir Auckland Colvin's Budget of last March thus reached the sum of £4,963,000.

Before taking the Committee further into the figures of the Budget this year, I would be glad if they would compare the real financial condition of India, in the past three years. Following the precedent of previous years, in order to show the present condition and future prospects of Indian finance, I ask the Committee to review with me the closed Accounts of 1883-4; the Revised Estimates of 1884-5, and the Budget Estimate of 1885-6. The Committee will remember that I stated that according to the closed Accounts for 1883-4 there was a surplus of £1,387,000. This surplus was, however, more apparent than real. From this surplus, if the Committee wish to arrive at the real financial results of the year 1883-4, we must deduct £569,000, the amount of Land Revenue collected in 1883-4 under special circumstances in Burmah, Madras, and Bombay, which would ordinarily have been collected in arrear in 1884-5, and which would probably, and indeed actually, have fallen into the Accounts of that year. This reduced the proper or adjusted surplus for 1883-4 to £818,000. Turning to the Revised Estimates for 1884-5 we find that the estimated deficit was £710,000; but from this deficit we must deduct the Land Revenue of £569,000 collected in 1883-4, but which would naturally have fallen into the year 1884-5. This reduces the deficit to £141,000 for that year. But even that deficit is only apparent. There is a further allowance to be made in respect of Land Revenue postponed to 1885-6, owing to floods and drought, amounting to £344,000; so that, if we take that amount from the deficit of £141,000, the apparent deficit for 1884-5 is turned into a surplus of £203,000. But in the accounts for 1883-4, now being made up, as telegraphed home to us, there are improvements in the Revised Estimate to the credit of the Imperial account of £796,000, making the real and adjusted surplus for 1884-5 £999,000, or close upon £1,000,000. If we apply to the Budget of March last this method of ascertaining the real financial position of India, which, I think, is a fair one, we shall find from the Budget Estimate, as calculated by Sir Auckland Colvin, that the surplus was estimated at £508,000, from which the Land Revenue of £344,000, belonging to 1884-5, but to be collected in 1885-6, must be deducted, and that leaves the adjusted surplus for 1885-6 at £164,000. The surplus, no doubt, is rather a low one, when compared with 1883-4 and 1884-5; but the Committee will remember that the three years taken together show an average surplus of £660,000, and it must be remembered that it is the practice of Indian Finance Ministers to estimate their Revenue very low and very cautiously. It is not improbable that the Revised Estimate for 1885-6, apart from all abnormal expenditure, will show a real and adjusted surplus of £300,000 or £400,000. I have made this digression in order that the Committee may not suppose that the financial position of India is so fluctuating as the figures for the three years might lead a chance observer to imagine; for these, taken alone, show a surplus of £1,387,000 in 1883-4, a deficit of £710,000 in 1884-5, and a surplus of £508,000 in 1885-6. This might lead people to suppose that the Indian Revenue is extremely spasmodic and jerky, or that the Indian Finance Ministers are extremely careless and inaccurate in their calculations.

I now have to ask the Committee to consider the Estimate of Expenditure for the current year. The Committee will remember that I stated that the deficit for the year unprovided for in Sir Auckland Colvin's Budget amounted to £4,963,000. I now wish to put the Committee in possession of the contemplated Ways and Means of the year, as they have been altered from the Budget Statement made by Sir Auckland Colvin in March. The Government of India, when they were brought face to face with this large extra expenditure, decided, and I think very wisely, that any attempt to impose fresh taxation in the course of the current year would be most undesirable; that it would throw all their accounts, and all their Revenue arrangements, into the utmost confusion. It was therefore determined to meet this extra and unprovided for expenditure in two ways—first, by economies in charge; and, secondly, by drawing on the balances. The Government of India, I am sure the Committee will recognize, have made admirable exertions in the way of reducing any expenditure which might, by any kind of argument whatever, be called unnecessary, and they have succeeded in effecting a saving in charge on the Revenue of the year of no less than £1,797,000. Of that sum, however, £700,000 is in reality capital expenditure, which would have been expended on railways and irrigation works in other parts of India, and would have been met with borrowed money, and also from that considerable economy must be deducted to some extent £643,000, which is the effect of the economies made by the Provincial Governments, who are entitled under the present Provincial contracts to have any sum so saved placed to their credit, under the head of what is called "Provincial surpluses," and which sums the Government of India are supposed, at some future day, to be bound to make good. These two reductions of £700,000 drawn from railways and irrigation works, and £643,000 economized by the Provincial Governments, leave an actual saving on expenditure by the Imperial Government of £454,000. In addition to that, the Government have telegraphed that the estimated railway receipts were taken too low in the Budget by no less a sum than £500,000. The drawings of the Secretary of State on India have been, on the demand of the Indian Government, reduced to such an extent that the loss by exchange, falling on the Revenues of India this year, will be lower than was calculated in March by £400,000; and those sums, taken together, make a total improvement of Revenue and Expenditure of £1,354,000. If the Committee will add that sum to the Budget surplus of £508,000, the amount of the charge unprovided for in Sir Auckland Colvin's Budget is reduced to £3,101,000.

Of course, the question arises how this very considerable sum is to be met. I told the Committee, and they appeared to agree with me, that fresh taxation in the course of the current year was most undesirable, and would be most confusing. A loan in India to that amount was hardly possible, and, perhaps, equally undesirable. Both these expedients have, therefore, been put aside, and the Government of India determined to increase the loan needed for irrigation and railways—the contemplated amount of which in the Budget had been estimated at £2,225,000—to £3,500,000 Stock, producing about £2,992,000 of money, giving an increased receipt to the resources of the year of £767,000. The balances in India on March 31, 1886, were estimated by the Budget in March last to be £10,205,000. These balances would have been weakened by the increased expenditure to the extent of £3,430,000; but they will now be strengthened by the improvement of railway receipts to the amount of £500,000, by economies to the amount of £1,097,000, and by the reduction of the drawings of the Secretary of State to the amount of £2,000,000, leaving a net increase of balance over what was estimated in the Budget of March last of £167,000.

I turn now to the Home Treasury. The balances in England were estimated by the Budget of March last as likely to be, on the 31st of March, 1886, £2,696,000. These balances will be reduced by the extra expenditure incurred in England to the amount of £1,025,000. They will be further reduced by the diminished drawings of the Secretary of State to the amount of £1,600,000, and these reductions would only have left to the Secretary of State a balance on the 31st of March, 1886, of £71,000. To this amount must be added an increase of the loan which I have spoken of to the amount of £767,000, and further receipts of capital from the Southern Mahratta Railway to the amount of £380,000, giving a balance on the 31st of March, 1886, as now estimated, of £1,218,000 instead of £2,696,000. The original unprovided charge of £3,101,000 has in reality been only partly provided for to the extent of £1,478,000 drawn from the balances in India; and although these will still leave a balance at home of £1,218,000, it is obvious that the balance is none too large. Indeed, it is rather too small to provide for the current expenditure of the year; and, therefore, not only is it more convenient, but I think more honest and accurate, to say that about £1,500,000 of the original deficit is really carried forward to next year, unprovided for either by temporary or permanent loans. I think the Committee will agree with me that this is a more accurate and fair view of the matter, when I state that the average balances in

India on the 31st of March for the last 10 years amounted to £14,000,000, and in England the average is £2,500,000. The average in both countries during the 10 years is £16,500,000 ; this year in India the balance is £10,000,000 ; in England the balance is about £1,500,000—and taking the two countries together £11,500,000.

The Committee is no doubt aware that the Government of India since 1881 has provided for, or rather has professed to provide for, £2,000,000 more than the estimated Expenditure of the year—that is to say, it has endeavoured to provide a surplus of £500,000 every year, and has also endeavoured to provide £1,500,000 for what is called the Famine Insurance Fund. The Committee is also aware that that £1,500,000—a provision which dates from 1881—is usually applied in three ways. It is usually applied first in direct famine relief; but the amount under this head since 1881 has been extremely small. It is also applied for the purpose of making railways and irrigation works as protection against famine generally to the amount of £750,000, and the remaining £750,000 has been taken for the reduction of the ordinary Debt. This year Sir Auckland Colvin proposed, in his Budget, to allot for the purposes of the Famine Insurance Fund £33,000 under the head of direct famine relief. He proposed, also, to take £287,000 from the Fund for the protective irrigation works. It was also proposed to spend on protective railways, State railways, and on Frontier railways an amount equal to £1,398,000 of Revenue, and to this sum was allotted from the Famine Insurance Fund £500,000. The railways provided for under that head were two railways in the Madras Presidency—the Cuddapore-Nellore and Bellary-Kistna, and in Rajpootana the Rewari-Ferozepore; in Oude, the Lucknow-Sitapur line was to be constructed from Provincial funds. But, Sir, the £700,000 which the Government of India has, in its emergency, provided for their expenditure has obviously been withdrawn from some of these works, and also the £680,000 from the Famine Insurance Fund, which would have gone to the reduction of the Debt, is really left in balances to meet general expenditure; and, though to this extent the amount which will have to be borrowed next year will be undoubtedly reduced, it is, perhaps, more honest and straightforward and correct to say that, to all intents and purposes, the Famine Insurance Fund has been swallowed up by the peculiar demands of the year.

I think the Committee will agree that this Financial Statement is not a very exhilarating anticipation, and also that it is rather "hard lines" upon the Minister coming into Office so recently to have to make his Financial Statement under circumstances which are certainly more or less depressing.

The Statement which I have made shows an unprovided charge of £1,500,000, and the celebrated Famine Insurance Fund practically eaten up. But I am sorry to say that is not all. There is more which I shall have to tell the Committee. The whole condition of India, political and financial, has been suddenly changed, and the change has not been for the better. I say suddenly changed; but the change ought not to have been sudden ; it ought to have been foreseen and provided for; but the change has been sudden, and for the suddenness of that change neither the Government of Lord Dufferin in India, nor the Government of Lord Salisbury at home, can in any way be held responsible. Then, Sir, not only for the purpose of clearing the present Government of all responsibility for this peculiar financial condition of affairs, but also for the purpose of enabling the Committee and the country to realize the real nature of the change which has come over India, I would ask the Committee to take a brief glance with me into the finances of the next year, 1886-7. Sir, in order that the Committee may understand what it really means in pounds, shillings, and pence, that India has ceased to be isolated from all contact with any European Power except ourselves, I may remind the Committee that last year a loan of £3,000,000 at 3 per cent was issued by the Indian Government in London at an average rate of 94, and this year a loan for the same amount, and at the same rate of interest, has been issued at an average rate of 85½. Well, I think the Committee will agree that a change of position, political and financial, which can cause Indian credit to fall in London by so much as 8 or 9 per cent in issue price is a change of great magnitude and of serious importance.

Sir, I have told the Committee the amount of extra military charge imposed on the Revenue of the current year on account of the ill-success of the negotiations in reference to the Afghan Frontier, and I place that extra charge at about £1,500,000. If that were all, if it were an abnormal charge—a charge not likely to recur—the Finance Minister might deplore it, but he need not be anxious or over-concerned. But, unfortunately, a large part of it cannot be treated now as abnormal. I put aside the question of Frontier railways, for which, as the Committee is aware, under the East India Loan Bill a sum of £5,000,000 has been provided. I put aside for the moment the question of the fortification of the frontier, and the additional railways necessary for the connection of these fortifications and for their proper defence, the additional charge for which may be taken, roughly, at something like £3,000,000. The Committee will recollect that that sum will not include the armament of the fortifications; and here I may mention that, in connection with these fortifications, the Government of India have just sent home a very elaborate and considerable plan for carrying into effect the policy which has been resolved upon in India and at home, and which has been unanimously approved by all Parties for strengthening, as far as human ingenuity can do it, the North-Western Frontier of India.

But what the Committee ought to look to now is the permanent increased military charge, which may amount to something like £2,000,000 a-year, and which can hardly be reduced below £1,500,000. Perhaps the Committee will be interested if I venture to go into details on this point. In the first place, Sir, the Indian Government have, with the sanction of the Secretary of State, provided for what I am astonished that the Government of Lord Ripon did not provide for before—the formation of a Reserve for the Indian Native Army. That will add, when the scheme is fully in operation, 250 long-service men to the strength of each regiment called out in times of emergency; and it will add to the strength of the Indian Army when called out for service in the field a total number of 26,700 men. This formation of a Native Reserve will cost the Revenues of India about 15 lakhs a-year. The second military measure which the times have rendered necessary is an increase of the Native Cavalry. It has been thought impossible to make any effectual Reserve of the Cavalry men, and it has therefore been thought necessary to keep your Cavalry arm up to its full strength—the strength which would be required should hostilities break out. Acting upon that opinion, the Government of India have, with the sanction of the Secretary of State, determined to increase the Bengal and Bombay Cavalry regiments from the strength of 550 sabres in three squadrons to the strength of 650 sabres in four squadrons, and to give one additional British officer to each. It has also been determined to create three new Cavalry regiments—two in Bengal and one in Bombay—of the increased new strength, and that will give a total increase of strength to the Indian Native Cavalry of 3,900, and the total additional cost to the Revenue of India will be 25 lakhs. It has also been determined to add to the five existing Goorkha regiments a separate battalion for each. The Durbar of Nepaul, with the utmost loyalty and generosity, has removed all restrictions which interfered with our recruiting for the Goorkha regiments, and we have determined to take advantage of the attitude —of the praiseworthy attitude—of the Nepaul Durbar, to increase the Goorkha regiments in the way I have mentioned. That will give us an increase of Infantry soldiers in that branch of 4,550 men, forming the finest fighting material to be found in the East, and possibly as fine as any that exists anywhere in the world. That will cost the Indian Government an additional outlay of 11 lakhs.

Now, Sir, it has also been determined to arm the Native troops with the Martini-Henry rifle. Of course, that is an arrangement which cannot be carried out all at once. It can only be done gradually, and its rapidity must depend, in a great degree, upon whether or not a new rifle is provided for the British Army. If the British soldier is supplied with a new rifle, that would, of course, release for the Indian Army the Martini-Henry's now in the possession of our troops at home. But for this year there will be a certain number of Martini-Henry's—I think about 40,000—provided for the Indian Army, which will cost the Indian Government £144,000. The total cost of re-arming the whole Army in this way I cannot now give.

In addition to all this there will also come on the Indian Revenues heavy charges for torpedoes and gun-boats for harbour and coast defence. The first outlay for this—I am only giving a rough estimate—will be from £200,000 to £250,000, and in addition to that you will have to calculate on a charge for the maintenance of the crews and equipment. I think I shall not be far wrong if I place the total extra cost imposed upon the Revenues of India under this head at about £1,000,000 sterling, roughly speaking.

Well, Sir, we must not conceal from ourselves, and no one of experience would deny, that this very important increase of the Native Army will probably necessitate an increase in the number of British troops in India, and, although that matter has not yet been decided upon, so far as the amount of the increase is concerned, by the Government of India, I think I may say that the principle has been decided upon; and the Committee will not go very far wrong if, taking all these additions together — and I doubt whether any Member of the Committee will question the necessity of taking them all together—the additions for fortifications, railways, and other miscellaneous items—and adding them all up, they may prepare themselves for an additional charge upon the Revenues of India of close upon £2,000,000 a-year, extending over an indefinite length of time. How we are to meet this charge it is not for me to say; but it is sufficient to say that it will tax to the utmost the skill and ingenuity of Lord Dufferin and his financial Advisers. The situation is full of difficulties. The extra available resources—financial resources—are narrow. Perhaps I may be allowed to indicate their nature, merely premising that there are objections to the use of nearly all, and very strong objections to the use of some. In the first place, we might attempt to meet the additional expenditure by loan; but that is a proceeding which should only be resorted to with great caution. In the second place, we might attempt to meet it by capitalizing a portion of the Famine Fund; but much the same thing may be said of that, and there would be considerable objections to that course. In the third place, the Government of India might resort to taxation; and under the head of taxation they have, I think, three courses open to them. They might recast, re-arrange, and extend the licence tax; and to that course I think there is no objection at all—on the contrary, there are reasons for performing that operation. Or they might re-impose the Income Tax; but to that there might be considerable objection. Or they might raise the Salt Tax; and to that course, I imagine, there would be enormous objection. The Committee will remember that no indirect taxation of great importance is any longer available. Anything in the direction of Customs' taxation of any financial value has been swept away, and there are insuperable objections to its re-imposition so long as you keep on in this country your present fiscal arrangements. Then there is a fourth means of getting money for the Government of India. I do not imagine, however, that the sum gained would be very large, and there might be an immense objection to its adoption. I mean the abrogation or revision of what are called "Provincial contracts." I do not think it is, at present, my duty to give any opinion on these four methods of getting money; but there is a method of getting money on which I would express a very strong opinion, and I hope the Committee will agree with me upon it, because it is of the utmost importance that Indian opinion in England should exert pressure upon English opinion in India. That method is, that due regard should be paid to economy. It seems almost a truism to say so in this country; but it is not a truism with respect to Indian finance. The expenditure under the Government of Lord Ripon has increased by no less a sum than £1,200,000 on Civil buildings and roads, thus bringing that charge up to something like £3,800,000; and that, surely, in times of emergency, might be made to bear a very considerable reduction. Then, I would ask, has not the time arrived when the expenditure from Revenue on railways and irrigation might be considerably reduced? In 1883-4 the Government of India spent £619,000 out of Revenue on these works; in 1884-5 they spent £1,498,000;

and last year they spent £1,685,000, giving an average expenditure out of Revenue on railways and irrigation for the last three years of £1,270,000. It does seem to me that if you are to have an expenditure which is absolutely necessary and vital to the interests of India and its security, and if that expenditure is increased to the extent which I have named, and if you find that a very large expenditure is going on upon Civil buildings and roads, and irrigation and railways, out of Revenue, the inference is obvious and irresistible that, if you have to choose between extra taxation on the one hand, which must press hardly upon populations which cannot be wealthy, and economies on the other hand, and a large cutting down of your Revenue expenditure upon public works, you are bound to choose the latter course, and you have no right to resort to the former until you have obtained from your enforced economies all the money which can reasonably and safely be realized from them in order to be expended upon such public works.

Sir, I do not dwell upon all these matters in order, in any way, to alarm the Committee or the country. There is nothing whatever, to my mind—and I speak the opinions of others of great authority — there is nothing whatever of a nature calculated to cause alarm as regards the financial condition of India. It is a condition of difficulty and, perhaps, of anxiety, but not of alarm. My reasons for placing all this before the Committee are widely different. My first reason is to fix the responsibility for the present state of things on the right shoulders; and, secondly, to interest public opinion, and bring home to the minds of the electors the real nature and character of the care and anxiety which must be borne by the Indian Viceroy. I wish to lay down, in the first place, that the greatest and, perhaps, the most unpardonable crime of which a Governor General of India can be guilty, is that he should not look ahead, and should not make provision for the future. The Government of England cannot, from its very nature, look very far head. Its policy is always policy rather from month to month and from week to week—sometimes from day to day. It is always more or less a policy from hand to mouth, and the reason is that your Government here depends on a Parliamentary majority, which is violently assailed and swayed by an enlightened, but, at the same time, a capricious public opinion. Sir, the Government of England has to think, in framing its policy, of the state of Europe, of our Colonies, of Ireland, of the state of Parties in England, of the elections, and last, but not least, of the state of Business in the House of Commons. It has to think of all these subjects besides India, and all these questions have to take their turn, and have all, more or less, their chance of modifying and colouring the policy of the Government. The result is that, although in England we possess an unrivalled Constitution and unexampled freedom, yet we have purchased that freedom at the price of little stability and little continuity in our Government, at the price of hardly any forethought as regards economy in our conduct of affairs. Of course the Committee will understand that these remarks of mine are intended to be perfectly general, and if there is any exception to be made to them it would be in the case of Her Majesty's present Government. But—and this is what I am leading to—the Government of India is exempt from all these disadvantages. It is a Government in its nature purely irresponsible and despotic; but perhaps it is a despotism of the best kind, because it is not hereditary. We do our best in this country to supply India from time to time with a statesman who shall exercise the tremendous powers of Government, and who shall, as well as being courageous, at the same time be wise and experienced, and moral and humane. In India it is not as it is in England. In India you have no public opinion to speak of—you have no power of the Press. You have hardly any trammels upon the Government of any sort or kind; and it is for that reason I say that, if the Governor General of India, in forming and framing his own policy, does not look ahead and provide for the future, he not only commits a blunder, but he is guilty of a crime. I am content to apply this general statement to the Government of Lord Ripon, and I will tell the Committee why I do so, and how I have arrived at that unfortunate conviction. Lord Ripon went out to India full of knowledge of the state of affairs in Europe. He knew all the events which had occurred, of the Russo-Turkish War which led to the Treaty of San Stefano, and to the Congress at Berlin—he knew that all these events had necessitated great preparations by Russia for war in India. He also had great knowledge—he must have had great knowledge—of the gradual, but sure, extension of the Russian Empire in that direction. Now, Sir, I do not say that there was any necessity why Lord Ripon should have been nervous, or fussy, or excited, or quarrelsome, or predatory. Nothing of the sort. But I want to ask whether the commonest prudence and most ordinary common sense would not have dictated that all these great historical facts should have been borne in mind, should have influenced his whole scheme of government, and had an important bearing on his financial arrangements? Well, Sir, what was the fact? I say nothing of the abandonment of Candahar, or of the "scientific Frontier." I say not much about the discontinuance and destruction of the Quetta Railway. I come rather to the acts of Lord Ripon's Government which affected the finance of those years, and which are seriously affecting the finance of this year. Sir, Lord Ripon had prosperous times to deal with. He had to deal with an increasing Revenue. The sky overhead, to an ordinary and careless observer, seemed very blue. Danger apparently had passed away, so far as foreign affairs were concerned, and so far as they had any bearing whatever on Indian finances, and Lord Ripon and his counsellors laid themselves down and slept. All indirect taxation of any value was remitted, Customs Duties were almost totally abolished, the Salt Duty was lowered very largely—admirable arrangements, Sir, in themselves, but defective, somewhat, in this—that no provision was made, and no forethought was taken, for the future. Sir, in 1882-3 the Native Army of India was reduced by five Cavalry regiments and 16 Infantry regiments. The British Army, under the care of the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Hartington), and in conjunction with the Viceroy, Lord Ripon, was allowed to fall by 10,000 men below its proper strength; and to bring it up to its full strength, which is now very nearly reached, has cost the Indian Government something like £100,000. No Frontier railways were commenced—I do not know that they were even planned—no Frontier roads were made, no preparations of any sort or kind were set on foot for the defence of that long and difficult Frontier, which surely in prosperous times a wise man would have provided for, in the event of a rainy day, and the provision being required. But no, Sir—in all these matters Lord Ripon slept, lulled by the langour of the land of the lotus. Yet there was much which ought to have aroused him. In 1882 the Russian Government themselves, with the utmost possible frankness and candour, called your attention to their proceedings in Central Asia, and invited you, at that time, to delimit the Frontier of Afghanistan, the territory of your Afghan Ally, and they only received a dull and sullen reply as from a man under the influence of a narcotic. You have had constant warnings, and it is curious to observe, in certain letters from the Ameer to Lord Dufferin, and in the accounts of his interview with him at Rawul Pindi, how constantly you come across the old familiar observation—"I told you so." Well, Sir, all the time Lord Ripon was there the cloud grew bigger, the distant darkness came nearer and grew blacker, and the great military Power loomed larger and more distinct upon your Borders. Lord Ripon and his counsellors slumbered and slept, never dreaming that any foreign danger could by any possibility come nigh those Dominions which had been entrusted to their watchful care, taking no thought for the morrow, heedless or ignorant of the future, which was shaping itself with the utmost clearness under their eyes. Then, Sir, there came a sharp and loud awakening. The Russian hosts absorbed the territory of Merv, and rapidly filled up the vacuum to the South which you had so incautiously and blindly left, and Lord Ripon and his counsellors were found, like the foolish virgins, with no oil in their lamps. Then followed the fruitless Frontier negotiations, and Lord Ripon came home, and Lord Dufferin went out, not one hour too soon for the safety of India, and for the tranquillity of our Indian Empire. Next we see the lonely and unsupported British Commissioner endeavouring to stop the advance of the Russian troops—troops flushed with success, and animated by the highest hopes of glory and of booty. Then came the incident of Penjdeh, and, following that, the Vote of Credit of £11,000,000. Next came the hasty and hurried recommencement of the Quetta Railway, which had been too foolishly abandoned. Then came the announcement of the Frontier railways and roads, which had been too fatally postponed. And then came your additional military expenditure in India of from £3,000,000 to £4,000,000; and the result of it all is now before the Committee, in the deficit on the Indian Accounts for the year of £1,500,000 sterling, and in the permanent extra military charge on the Revenue of India of no less than £2,000,000 sterling. Now, Sir, the good times are gone. The available financial resources have got very narrow, and those that you had in Lord Ripon's time have been wantonly thrown away. No economy of any sort or kind was practised by Lord Ripon's Government. The expenditure on Civil buildings, as I have already said, was allowed to be increased by over £1,000,000 a-year. Your Famine Insurance Fund, of which you made so much, has been proved to be in time of trial illusory. I look back on that Viceroyalty, and I declare that, although I endeavoured to contemplate the action of the late Government of India without any Party passion at all, I am unable to find in it one redeeming feature. I see the great and noble and necessary policy of admitting the Natives to a large and gradually increasing share in the Government of India, so clumsily, so stupidly handled that it has been thrown back possibly for a generation. I see recklessness and carelessness in the management of home and foreign affairs; and as Secretary of State, having to place these results before the House of Commons in the practical matter-of-fact form of figures and facts, I disown and repudiate, on behalf of the present Government, responsibility of any sort or kind for that policy, and I hold up that Viceroyalty and the Government which was responsible for it, and the Government which sanctioned it, and the Government which adopted it and introduced it, to the censure and the condemnation of the British and Indian peoples.

Sir, I have thought it right, in justice to the present Government, and in the interest of India, to place the situation before the Committee in a somewhat dark and gloomy light; but I have done so in order that the enormous change which has come over the condition of the Government of India may be realized. But the Committee and the public would altogether misconstrue and misinterpret my remarks, and also misinterpret the situation, if they imagined that it was in any way of a desperate character, or that there was anything in it which could not be dealt with by the tact, skill, and experience of Lord Dufferin, or that Indian finance, at the present moment, was not perfectly capable of adapting itself to the circumstances, and enduring even heavier charges than those I have indicated to the Committee as necessary.

I shall, therefore, be glad to show the Committee, by facts and figures, that the Indian Revenue is elastic and growing, and that it would be the greatest possible mistake to suppose that there is not in reality a very large margin of reserve on which the Indian Government, in time of difficulty, might come. It is of the last importance that Indian credit should stand as high as it deserves to stand, and that it ought not to be regarded as in the least degree shaken by anything which may have occurred lately. It is for that reason that I will ask the Committee to look at the statistics of Indian finance as exemplified by a period of 10 years. I will take the decade which has just elapsed—1874-5 to 1884-5—and I will compare the figures of 1874-5 with the figures of 1884-5. That is an interesting period, for during that time two Governments have held Office in England, and three Viceroys held Office in India. In 1874 the total net Revenue from the 11 principal sources, including Land, Opium, Salt, Stamps, Excise, and Customs, was £40,392,000. In 1884 the total net Revenue from the same sources was £42,293,000, showing an increase of Revenue of nearly £2,000,000 in 10 years. I will take, Sir, the principal heads of that Revenue, the heads which are generally assumed to show the financial position of the taxpayers — Salt, Stamps, and Excise. I find that in 1874 the Salt Tax yielded to the Government of India £5,736,000, and that, although since that time the duty on salt has been remitted to the extent of 28 per cent, the Salt Tax in 1884 yielded £5,862,000, showing an increase of Revenue in 10 years of

£126,000, in spite of the remission of taxation. I find that in 1874 Stamps yielded £2,597,000; and in 1884 £3,407,000—an increase of £810,000, of which only £120,000 was increased taxation. The Excise in 1874 yielded to the Government of India £2,251,000, and in 1884 £3,887,000, showing an increase of £1,636,000, of which only £56,000 was increased taxation. Customs in 1874 brought in £2,422,000, and in 1884 only £861,000; but this decrease is most satisfactorily accounted for by the remission of the Customs Duties in 1883, by Sir Evelyn Baring, to the amount of £1,929,000. In a word, while you find an increase of Revenue in the 10 years amounting to £2,000,000, you find that in that period there has been a net remission of taxation, after allowing for the increase of Provincial rates and assessed taxes, amounting to £2,424,000. Well, now, if to this you add your profits or your charges incurred by productive public works, you will arrive at a still more satisfactory result. In 1874 the productive public works were a charge upon the Revenue of India to the extent of £1,436,000; but in 1884 they brought in a net profit of £566,000, showing an improved position under this head, in 10 years, to the extent of £2,002,000. The interest on ordinary Debt and obligations in 1874 was £4,289,000; but in 1884 it had fallen to £3,704.000, showing a decrease of charge, by way of interest, of £585,000; or, in other words, a reduction of capital Debt to the amount of £14,000,000. Further, in these 10 years you have had to meet an increased charge for Civil Government to the extent of £2,000,000, as compared with 1874; an increased charge for non-productive public works of £783,000, as compared with 1874; an increased charge for Army expenditure of £718,000, as compared with 1874; and an increased loss by exchange of no less than £2,467,000, because the loss by exchange in 1874 was only £786,000, while in 1884 it reached the tremendous figure of £3,253,000. In the 10 years the expenditure on famine relief was £10,854,000; and in the same period India has had to meet charges for the Afghan War amounting to £11,840,000. The net general expenditure in these 10 years, under the nine principal heads of Interest, Post Office, Civil Departments, Miscellaneous Charges, Famine Relief, Non-productive Public Works, Army, Exchange, and Provincial Contracts, has increased from £37,739,000 in 1874 to £42,343,000 in 1884—an increase of £4,604,000; yet during all that time your India Revenue has been steadily growing—so elastic and so rebounding, under all these increasing and fresh liabilities, that the Indian Government has been able to make a net reduction of taxation to the extent of nearly £2,500,000, and still finds itself, under ordinary circumstances, apart from abnormal charges, able to show a clear actual surplus of Revenue over Expenditure.

Whether it was wise in 1883-4 to make that large remission of taxation is another question. I have already said that I think, if the foreign policy of the late Government had been more prudent and more far-sighted, that large remission of taxation would not have been made; or, at any rate, it would have been made more gradually and more carefully. Whether it was wise to allow your Civil Expenditure and Revenue Expenditure on public works to grow so rapidly and so largely, while you, at the same time, remitted taxation so liberally, is another matter on which I venture to detain the Committee for a few moments. I have given these figures in order that the public at home may see for themselves that the Indian financial resources still possess an immense amount of vitality, and that there is no reason at all why Indian credit should not stand as high as, or perhaps even higher than, it has ever done since the connection between Great Britain and India began.

Sir, if the financial situation of India may be fairly considered as being of an enduring character, to whom ought that credit to be attributed? I have said a word about the Viceroyalty of Lord Ripon, and I will now say a word about another Viceroyalty which has had very scant justice done to it. I allude to the Viceroyalty of Lord Lytton. The closing years of Lord Lytton's Viceroyalty were darkened by the Afghan War, and that most untoward event excited in this country the fiercest Party passions, and all that was good and sound and wise in the Administration of Lord Lytton was for the time lost sight of; but, Sir, this is an undoubted fact, and a fact which ought now to be brought to light, that, if you have now in India economical, healthy, and decentralized finance, it is entirely the work of Lord Lytton—[Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL: Oh, oh!]—who, I assert, with all due deference to the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy, carried into effect Lord Mayo's policy of giving the Provincial Governments that control over, and that interest in, their own financial prosperity which is essential to frugal administration. If you have complete Free Trade in India, again I say it is the work of Lord Lytton, who, differing from and resisting and overruling his Council, carried out the policy of Lord Salisbury, which was greatly opposed by Lord Northbrook, and, by abolishing the duties on certain classes of coarser cotton goods, enabled Sir Evelyn Baring, in 1883, to free the remaining cotton imports from duty. If you have in India at the present moment the Salt Tax equalized and reduced, so that it does not press heavily on the masses of the people, that, again, is entirely the work of Lord Lytton, who, with immense patience and immense labour, succeeded in abolishing 2,500 miles of Inland Customs line through the heart of India, and in concluding Salt Treaties with no less than 36 Native States. All these preliminary and difficult operations made it very easy indeed for Sir Evelyn Baring, in 1883, to lower the Salt Tax in India. Sir, I say these are deeds which are a good mark in favour of any Administration. They were obscured, even denied and lost sight of, by what was, perhaps, one of the most wild storms of Party passion that ever swept across and devastated Indian politics at the time of the outbreak of the Afghan War. But now that that storm has passed away those are deeds that can be brought to light and demonstrated, because they were deeds which were difficult in their conception, which were large in their operation, and which were permanent in their beneficial effects; and they were deeds which merit, and which will, I am sure, receive at the proper time the recognition and commendation of an enlightened and instructed and impartial public.

Sir, I pass from all these matters, which I thought it was essential I should dwell upon, but which I admit are, to some large extent, matters of controversy, and I proceed rapidly to subjects of more general interest and agreement. It has been usual for the Secretary of State, in his Annual Statement in the House of Commons, to glance at the condition and progress of India in other branches than those purely financial. Time, however, prevents me. I think I have almost exceeded the limit of indulgence of the Committee, and I am, moreover, not particularly anxious to lead the Committee into a string of other questions now, because I am so anxious that its attention should be concentrated on the peculiar circumstances of the year, and on the transformation of the political and financial position and prospects affected in India by the close proximity to her Borders of a great European Power which is sustained and defended by an adventurous and advancing army.

But perhaps the Committee will allow me to draw their attention rapidly to four circumstances. In the first place, I would ask attention to the new opium arrangement with China. On this subject Papers will be at once presented to Parliament, if they have not already been presented; and I will only say it is estimated that, under this arrangement, China will gain an addition to her Revenue of over £1,000,000 a-year, and that India may lose about £250,000 a-year. But the arrangement has, or ought to have, at any rate, the most excellent effect of bringing into active operation much of the Chefoo Convention which hitherto has been a dead letter; and it has, or ought to have, the effect of being a settlement perfectly agreeable and advantageous to the powerful and enlightened Government of China, of grievances and causes of complaint which have for many years been a source of great difficulty and anxiety. I am quite willing to concede whatever merit is due in this matter arising from the determination of these long negotiations to Lord Granville and Lord Kimberley, who had charge of them.

The second subject on which I would like to draw the attention of the Committee, but, as it is rather late, I will pass it by, is that of the principles of the re-settlement of land by the Government, which have undergone very considerable modifications, modifications effected by long correspondence between the Secretary of State and the Viceroy of India, but which modifications are, undoubtedly, in the interest of the cultivators of the country.

Sir, the third subject on which I desire to say a few words is that of the conservation of the Indian forests. On that point I may say that, since 1858, 48,000 square miles of forests have been preserved under systematic conservation, and to those 48,000 square miles have been added another 30,000 square miles of village or district forests, which are, as it were, protected by Government. In 1859 the net Revenue to the Government of India from forests was £150,000, and in 1883 it was £370,000. No doubt, in some parts the forest laws have been necessarily very stringent, and have produced complaints from the people, and have inflicted hardship. I have ascertained that these complaints and this hardship are principally in the Presidency of Bombay; but I am happy to say His Excellency, Lord Reay, has with great propriety and wisdom appointed a Commission to investigate that hardship, and, if possible, to disclose a remedy. But the Committee will understand that it is a question of very considerable difficulty how you are, on the one hand, to obtain the most desirable object of preserving and renewing your forests, without, on the other hand, entailing hardship on the people by depriving them of privileges of which they have had valuable and long enjoyment.

The fourth subject to which I will briefly direct attention is that of Indian railways. There is now opened to traffic a total length of 12,000 miles, of which 1,218 have been added in 1884-5. Although 1884-5 was undoubtedly an extremely dull year for trade, and although, as evidence of that dulness, the trade fell off to the extent of 500,000 tons, still the net receipts show a payment of interest on capital to the extent of £5 1*s*. 9*d*. per cent, as compared with £5 13*s*. 6*d*. per cent in 1883-4. I am sure the Committee will think that is a satisfactory and encouraging circumstance.

Well, Sir, the Committee will be delighted to know I have very nearly brought my remarks to a close; but there is one other matter in which I take the greatest possible interest, and to which I will for a moment refer. Her Majesty's Government have decided that, if they are in Office next year, or if by some unforeseen circumstance they are in Opposition next year, they will either propose themselves, or support, a Motion for an inquiry into the system of government in India. Twenty-seven years have now elapsed since the Government of India was taken over by the Crown, and inquiries into special subjects during that time have been made, such as Indian finance and Indian railways; but there has been no general inquiry into the operation of the various Acts establishing the present system and machinery of government in India; and it is into the system and the machinery of the Government of India in all its parts that inquiry, as far as the present Government are concerned, will be strictly and closely made. Sir, there are many reasons in favour of such an inquiry. There is, in the first place, the general value of Parliamentary inquiries. Nothing is ever made worse, but everything may probably be made better than it is, by a thorough reviewing and overhauling by Parliament. In the second place, the reason why I support the idea of holding an inquiry is that the arrangement under which the old East India Company ruled India provided for a Parliamentary review of their system every 20 years. Every 20 years they had to come to Parliament for a renewal of their Charter, and every review of their system was attended with most valuable results to the Empire generally. There is a third reason which I think should invite Parliament to that inquiry, and that is one which I have alluded to already in the course of my remarks—namely, the altered circumstances under which the Government of India will have to be carried on in the future. In the fourth place, you have, by the system of education you have carried on for many years in India, by your free Press, by the influence of Western civilization, produced a large body of most intelligent Native opinion, which, perhaps, has not yet, for some cause or other, been allowed to exercise that amount of influence upon the Government of India which may at the present time be regarded as reasonable, as healthy, and as safe. I know of my own personal knowledge many Natives of different classes, different religions, and different races, of great intelligence, and of the most undoubted loyalty, who are strongly of opinion that they have perceived defects in our machinery, by no means, up to the present moment, of a serious nature, but defects which fair inquiry and careful consideration would probably remedy and remove. Whether the views of these gentlemen be right or wrong I do not say; but I hold it to be in the highest sense politic and advisable that Parliament should hear and consider their opinions, as well as the opinions of experienced Anglo-Indian authorities. I think that such action by the Imperial Parliament will go far to bridge over that gap which still, to some extent, I regret to say, exists between the rule of the European and the sympathy of the Hindoo; and it will be a forcible indication to the Native mind that their interests, their prosperity, and their security are closely and carefully watched over by their British and their Irish fellow-subjects at home. [*Laughter.*] I cannot see anything in what I have said to laugh at. The hon. Member for Kirkcaldy seems to think it a subject of ridicule that Irishmen should take an interest in India. All I can tell the hon. Gentleman, for his information, is that, if there has been, as undoubtedly there has been, a great improvement in the management of the Indian gaols, and if more humane methods have been introduced, it is entirely owing to the repetition of Questions continually put by the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell). That is only one instance; but I could cite others; and I own I am surprised that it should be a matter of ridicule that I referred to our Irish fellow-subjects.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL: I hope I may be allowed to explain. It was the newness of the phrase which excited my amusement.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Lord Randolph Churchill): Well, the word British only applies to England and Scotland. It does not include the Irish at present, and therefore I designedly used it. I cannot, myself, detect any appreciable danger—if, indeed, there could be any danger—which can arise from such an inquiry. If there be any such danger, I am convinced it will be far outweighed and overborne by the advantages of many kinds which ought to result from an inquiry wisely and cautiously conducted. On this particular subject I will say no more at present, except that the exact nature of the Reference, the scope of the inquiry, and the constitution of the Committee, will, during the Recess, receive the closest and most anxious consideration of Her Majesty's Government, and of myself, assisted by my Council.

I am extremely grateful to the Committee for having allowed me to take up their time at such great length; and, in conclusion, before moving the formal Resolution, I will express a hope—an earnest hope—which I trust the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy may share, that the new Parliament which is to be elected by the new constituencies may manifest a more eager and a more sustained interest in Indian affairs than has hitherto been manifested by Parliament. This Parliament, Sir Arthur Otway, has done little or nothing for India. Beyond a dole of £5,000,000, and a Committee on Railways, India has remained outside the scope of the attention of this Parliament, except, perhaps, when it has been necessary to give a mechanical approval to a course of policy which events have proved to be so disastrous. It would really appear as if Members of Parliament of the present generation consider Indian affairs to be either beneath their attention or above their comprehension; and India is, apparently, left to pursue its destiny alone, and some might even think uncared for, as far as Parliament is concerned. That was not always the case. In the last century, when our Indian Empire was forming, the greatest men—Mr. Pitt, Mr. Burke, Mr. Fox—did not disdain to apply their minds, and led their respective Parties into a most careful examination and exposition of the most difficult and complicated Indian questions, and with great advantage to the Empire. I do not think that at the present time, when everything round is changing so fast, and when nothing seems secure or firm, or free from assault and danger, as far as India is concerned, I do not think that we shall act unwisely if we revert to the more patriotic practice of earlier days. I would ask those who have been so kind as to listen to me, and those who possibly may not have agreed in many remarks I have made, at any rate to agree in this—to join with me in what I would call an appeal, or even almost a command, to those who will be our Successors, in the hope that some faint echo of that appeal may possibly linger around these walls and influence the new Parliament so shortly to meet here—to shake themselves free from the materialism, the lassitude, the carelessness, and the apathy, which have too long characterized the attitude of Parliament towards the Dependency of India. I would appeal to them to watch with the most sedulous attention, to develop with the most anxious care, to guard with the most united and undying resolution, the land and the people of Hindostan — that most truly bright and precious gem in the Crown of the Queen—the possession of which, more than that of all your Colonial Dominions, has raised in power, in resource, in wealth, and in authority, this small Island of ours far above the level of the majority of nations and of States, and has placed it on an equality with, —perhaps even in a position of superiority over — every other Empire of ancient or of modern times. The noble Lord concluded by formally moving the Resolution.

Motion made, and Question proposed,

"That it appears, by the Accounts laid before this House, that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1884 was £71,727,421, including £13,240,507 received from Productive Public Works; that the Total Expenditure in India and in England was £70,339,925, including £12,032,754 spent on Productive Public Works (Revenue Account); that there was an excess of Revenue over Expenditure in that year of £1,387,496; and that the Capital Expenditure on Productive Public Works in the same year was £3,992,029, including a Charge of £566,261 incurred in the redemption of previously existing liabilities."—(*Lord Randolph Churchill.*)

MR. J. K. CROSS: I am sure, Sir Arthur Otway, that, after you have read the Resolution which we have met together to consider, it will not be necessary for me to draw down the Committee from the extraordinary altitude in which the noble Lord has soared to the lower level of the finances of the Indian Empire, which is the subject the Committee have to consider. I can only say that it would have been more courteous if the noble Lord had given some intimation of the kind of attack he was about to make on the policy of the Marquess of Ripon; because, if the noble Lord had done so, some Members of the Opposition might have been prepared to follow him through some of the luminous Eastern mists into which he has taken the Committee. On this occasion I must venture earnestly to protest against the new kind of action the noble Lord has brought to bear upon the Annual Statement of Indian Finance which we have had in times gone by. This is the first occasion within my recollection, as I believe it is the first within the recollection of any Member of the Committee, when, under cover of a Financial Statement, a wild partizan attack has been made upon the government of a late Viceroy, and that, too, when neither he nor anybody else knew anything at all about the attack which was about to be made, when nobody had a chance of looking into the questions that were to be submitted to the Committee, and no opportunity was afforded for examining them, as they ought to be examined, so that hon. Members on this side of the House might be prepared to make such answer as might be called for. The charges which the noble Lord brings against the administration of the Marquess of Ripon are that he was totally careless about defence, and that he was altogether wrong in the method he adopted for the administration of the affairs of India, and especially in regard to the way in which he approached the very grave question of the treatment of matters affecting the Natives; and, as regards Russia, it is said that we ought to have foreseen, several years before the events, things which have just taken place. Well, but if we are to go a long way into the past, let me ask why did not the former Conservative Government foresee the action with which Russia threatened us in 1878-9? Why did not they, long before the murder of Sir Louis Cavagnari at Cabul, begin to construct the Northern Frontier Railways, and complete the communication between Quetta and the Indus, when our troops were interned, 270 miles away, without any means of communication, except by waterless desert and trackless mountain? The noble Lord might have some reason to say that then we did, to some extent, neglect our duties in not criticizing the action or inaction of the Government. But it was not until after the murder of Sir Louis Cavagnari, in 1879, that it ever occurred to the Conservative Government that it was desirable to improve our means of communication to the North, and extend it from the Valley of the Indus to Quetta; and it therefore ill-becomes the noble Lord to make an attack like this, and especially without Notice. It is quite unnecessary to go further into the matter than to make an earnest protest against it, and to say that, if such attacks are to be made in future under cover of an Indian Revenue Statement, it must lead to a change in the line of action between the two Parties in this House on Indian subjects. The late Government, when they came into power in 1880, might have gone far back and have alluded to the deficiencies in the Indian finances caused by the Afghan War, which the noble Lord appears now to glory in, but of which, at the time, the whole country was heartily ashamed, and of which we are now reaping some of the consequences. The noble Lord spoke of the financial arrangements under the Marquess of Ripon. As far as I am concerned, I have had the honour of making two Financial Statements, and I will lay before the Committee the anticipations which were formed of a surplus of Indian Revenue, and the way in which those anticipations have been realized. In 1882 I anticipated a surplus of £224,000; the surplus realized was £707,000. In 1883 the estimated surplus was £368,000; but there was actually realized £1,387,000, as it appears in the Accounts. In 1884-5 the surplus, according to the Statement of the noble Lord, would be nearly £900,000, or, if reduced by the £340,000 which, as the noble Lord rightly says, ought to be credited to the previous year, it would be something near £600,000. Thus, in these three years 1882-3, 1883-4, and 1884-5, a surplus was realized of £2,600,000, against an anticipated surplus of £700,000. And this is the finance of the Marquess of Ripon's Government, which the noble Lord positively comes down here and stamps upon so fiercely. It is not necessary for me to follow the noble Lord into the careful calculation he has made with regard to the finance of the last two years. I have nothing to say against the line the noble Lord has taken in making that Statement of Revenue and Expenditure, which I am bound to say he has very fairly put before the Committee. But with regard to what is to be done in the future, I am not, however, sure that I can follow the noble Lord so clearly. The noble Lord seems to think it impossible to obtain anything like a considerable increase from taxation in India. He has pointed out that the Salt Tax is now producing much more than it did under the Government of the Earl of Northbrook; but that at the same time the rate of the tax has been reduced by 28 per cent. The noble Lord seemed to bemoan the reduction of the Salt Tax with one breath and to approve of it with another. I did not, at first, gather from the noble Lord's speech whether he intended to propose any increase of that tax. At the end, however, of the noble Lord's Statement he said nothing could be further from his intention than to increase the tax, and he hoped that no such proposition would be made.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL): I said that there were immense objections to it.

MR. J. K. CROSS: I agree with the noble Lord that there are considerable objections to it; but as the tax was reduced by the amount of 28 per cent only four years ago, and as the noble Lord seems to wish that we should go back to the financial arrangements of four years ago, it was the logical outcome of his argument to say that it might be desirable to increase the Salt Tax. As a matter of fact, there are very few taxes in India which can be increased. The Land Revenue is a fixture. The receipts which are derived from other taxes amount to 18 crores of rupees a-year; and if we deduct the Provincial rates, for the Provincial rates are not really Imperial taxation at all, the result is that there are only about 14¾ crores of rupees on which financial ingenuity can be exercised. I am quite willing to admit that that is a very small amount. The noble Lord says there ought to be a considerable reduction in Civil buildings, roads, bridges, railways, and similar items. Let us note for a moment what is the expenditure which comes under the head of Civil buildings, roads, bridges, and other services. I am quite willing to allow that it is possible, if the expenditure on means of communication is to be checked, and all building is to stop, to reduce expenditure by no less than £1,500,000. But in that case no more Post Offices and no more Revenue buildings must be built, and no more money spent on buildings for residences for Governors, Lieutenant Governors, Secretariats, and other official bodies. But still officials must be provided with tolerably comfortable offices and houses. It is in the last few years when the Revenue exceeded the Expenditure, and there were good, handsome surpluses, that the Government of India have considered it possible to increase the expenditure on buildings of this nature. Then there has been considerable expenditure on gaols, which the noble Lord approves. My noble Friend who three years ago was Secretary of State for India (the Marquess of Hartington) has recognized the good service rendered in respect of Indian gaols by the hon. Member for Dungarvan (Mr. O'Donnell). But if you are going on with expenditure of that nature you will not meet the noble Lord's wishes. Then the question arises—are we to reduce the expenditure on the making and repair of roads, the repair of public buildings, and on the building and repair of bridges? All of these things have to come under the consideration of the Government of India; and when the Government of India find that they cannot spend the amount of money which has been customary during the last two or three years on these works, no doubt it will be their duty, and I should also hope their wish, to reduce the expenditure in this direction as much as they possibly can. The noble Lord also spoke of a reduction of expenditure on railways out of Revenue. During the last six years there has been considerable expenditure on railways and irrigation works, amounting to no less than £9,000,000. He spoke of the enormous expenditure on Exchange, and seems to think that it is a very great evil. The loss caused by Exchange is one which may very well exercise the noble Lord's patience. It is a very serious evil indeed, and it would be very well if the noble Lord would go carefully into the consideration of the question. Of course, he has not yet been long at the India Office; but I would venture to suggest to him that if during the Recess he will take into consideration the whole of the circumstances which bear upon the question of Exchange he may be able to place before the House of Commons some proposition which may, perhaps, save us from having to contemplate so enormous a loss on the Exchange as that which threatens to come upon us if the expenditure of India in this country continues at its present rate, and if the interest on the loans which have to be issued in this country has to be remitted from India. This item of expenditure is governed to a great extent by the flow of capital from England to India, and from India to England. It is affected also by low prices. Another item in the consideration of the matter is the amount of the annual outgoings from India; and the third item is the price of silver. Before I left Office I endeavoured to obtain as much information as I could on the subject, and I hope that this information will be placed before the House in the form of a Return, showing, among other things, the flow of bullion from England to India, and from India to England. It is an important consideration to take into account, whether the merchants are at the present time increasing their investments in India or withdrawing capital from there. There is one thing which I very much desire the noble Lord to remember, and it is that every £1,000,000 sterling borrowed in England costs the Government of India no less a sum than £35,000 annually. That sum comes home in produce in payment of the interest that is due. No coin passes; and, therefore, it is incumbent on the Indian Government to see that, whenever £1,000,000 is borrowed for public works, India is made thereby the richer to the extent of at least £35,000 a-year. If not, you must suffer considerable financial loss; and, consequently, it is absolutely necessary, in borrowing money in England for the development of the resources of India, to take care that you do not borrow unless you are certain that a full and proper result will be achieved. I am not quite sure whether the noble Lord told us what the arrangements are that have been made with the new Railway Company — the Indian Midland. I invite him, if he has an opportunity of speaking again, to make a statement in reference to the arrangements which have been made with that Company. The noble Lord spoke of a Commission of Inquiry to examine into the system of Government in India. I do not think that he indicated whether the constitution of the Indian Council would be one of the subjects of inquiry.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL): The inquiry will embrace the whole of the constitution of the Government of India.

MR. J. K. CROSS: I cannot offer any objection to such a proposal. Everyone would be much interested in such an inquiry; and I have no doubt that it would result in great good. I trust that it will also include an inquiry into the status and position of the local Armies in India. That is an inquiry which I should like to see carried out as fully as possible. There was a Commission of Inquiry a short time ago at Simla, and it reported in favour of considerable changes, which changes were considered in this country; but it was decided that it was not desirable at the time to go into them. It was decided, in fact, that no considerable change should then be made. I am myself of opinion that when the state of our Indian Army comes to be inquired into thoroughly, it will be found that some branches are not so efficient as we could wish, and on that ground I welcome the statement of the noble Lord that the inquiry will be general.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL): It will include the Army.

MR. J. K. CROSS: I hope it will include an inquiry into the status and position of the three local Armies of India. The noble Lord has intimated that considerable expense was incurred by us in not going on with the Frontier Railway as rapidly as we might have done. He tells us that among the alterations made since the Budget is one which involves an expenditure of £1,180,000 for increased rapidity of construction of the Scinde-Pishin Line, storage of railway material, and construction of temporary line to the head of the Bolan Pass. I think that the noble Lord, only a few days ago, in reply to a Question, said that a considerable amount of material was now being stored at Quetta for the purpose, under certain conditions, of continuing the railway to Candahar. I hope it will not be necessary to lay down that line, although it may, to a certain extent, have been sanctioned during the tenure of Office of the late Government; but if we strengthen our position at Quetta —if we make communications direct to Quetta, and complete the line of Frontier communication which I ventured to describe to the House on the 23rd of March last, and strengthen ourselves along the whole of the Indus Valley line of defence—it appears to me that that is the best way in which we can meet any possible advance that may be made against us. This is the true line of defence for the Government of India against any complications which may arise. Our line of Frontier defence will then extend from Peshawur to Kurrachee, with a covering line from the Indus to Quetta; and if that line of defence were made impregnable, it appears to me that it would be a better line than any of those proposed by the former Conservative Government. Although the noble Lord has spoken with regret of the abandonment of the scientific Frontier by the late Government when they took Office, I may say that it is not correct to say that it was abandoned by us, but that it was practically demolished when Sir Louis Cavagnari was murdered at Cabul. I do not know whether it is necessary to go further into the statements which have been made by the noble Lord. In the efforts which he wishes to see made for economy I entirely and heartily concur. With the protests he has made against the policy of the Marquess of Ripon in regard to the reduction of taxation I cannot in the least agree, because, considering the surpluses of which he has spoken, I am certain that no Governor General having those surpluses in hand would have thought of putting them by for the purpose of providing a fund for meeting any future military measures. In India we are, as the noble Lord has observed, in a very grave and serious position, although it is hard to say whether the noble Lord regards it as very serious or very dangerous. From the beginning of his speech it might have been thought clear that the noble Lord was impressed with the difficulties of the position; but towards the end of the exceedingly bitter Party attack which he made upon the late Government he seemed to veer completely round, and to give in his adhesion to the present financial state of India as being perfectly sound and solid. No doubt, we have grave responsibilities with regard to India. The Dependency is one which, under any circumstances, must tax the energies and ability of any statesman at the helm of the State. In that country, upon the remnants of a civilization old and strange and well-nigh passed away, but not forgotten, we are striving to plant the customs and culture of the West. In that country new thoughts are entering the minds of men who for ages have only sought how they might earn their bread from day to day. These men as yet are dumb. They have no representation here; but everybody can see that in a future, not remote, they must and will be heard. On this point the noble Lord has spoken very eloquently; and I can only say that I hope his anticipations may be realized. I thank the Committee for having listened to these few and imperfect remarks. In conclusion, I wish again to enter my protest against the extraordinary method the noble Lord has taken of bringing forward, under cover of an Indian Financial Statement, a bitter partizan attack upon his Predecessors in the Indian Government. I will only express a hope that in the future we may revert to a policy which would be better for England and better for India.

General Sir GEORGE BALFOUR: Sir Arthur Otway, when you and I listened to the gloomy description by the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India of the state of the finance of India, our thoughts unavoidably turned to the years 1859 and 1860, when the bankruptcy of India was fully expected owing to the vast expenditure caused by the Mutiny of the Bengal Army and to the loss of Revenue from the disturbed state of the country. But India recovered from its then financial embarrassments after incurring a Debt by the Mutiny of about £35,000,000. In 1862 the Accounts showed a surplus of Income over Expenditure. Since then the surpluses and deficiencies of the ordinary Accounts may be said to have balanced each other; and I hope that with careful control over the outgoings we may look forward to a future surplus, instead of to the large deficiency prognosticated by the noble Lord. But, in spite of the anxious and desponding forebodings we have heard to-night, I was delighted to hear that the noble Lord spoke in hopeful terms of the possibility of carrying on the Government without the necessity of resorting to increased taxation. I was delighted to hear the assurance, for if my hon. Friend the Member for Orkney (Mr. Laing) was in his place, he would be able to tell the Committee of the strong feeling entertained by Lord Canning against adding to the burdens of the people of India. To both my hon. Friend (Mr. Laing) and myself Lord Canning repeatedly asserted that he would prefer risking danger from having a small but less costly Army, than face the great danger which would be general throughout India from heavy taxation. To this view I give my adherence. I believe that our rule is in greater danger from financial causes than from internal or external disturbances. Amongst the several openings for additional sources of income, the noble Lord spoke of the Salt Tax; this was on the idea that within the last few years this tax had been so lightened as to lower the price of salt to the people of India by 28 per cent; and though from the noble Lord's words I understood him to imply that this Salt Tax would not be raised, yet I feel called upon to urge not only to abstain from raising the price of an article consumed by the poorest classes, but, if possible, to try and still further reduce the present rate of two rupees a maund of 82 pounds weight, or 54 rupees a ton. I submit this claim the more confidently, because the assumed reduction in price of 28 per cent is applicable only to Bengal; there the price was lowered, but the cost was largely increased in Madras and Bombay. There, the gross income derived from salt is stated at £2,755,348; whilst in the rest of India the amount is only £3,422,433—that is, the population of the two Presidencies being 47,000,000, whilst that of the rest of India is 152,000,000, shows a great inequality in the incidence of this tax, and against the people of Madras and Bombay. But it is not alone the Salt Tax which bears heavily on the people of Madras and Bombay; but generally all the eight important heads of Revenue yield more ratably from the two divisions than from the seven other divisions of India. The tabular statement in the Finance Accounts of 1862-3 show that in ratio to 1,000 of the population the two divisions yield £284, and to every 1,000 square miles £51,096, whereas in the seven other divisions the ratio is £161 to 1,000 population, and of only £40,348 to 1,000 square miles. I may also add that dear salt is more heavily felt in

Madras and Bombay, because of the people's food needing this article more than in other parts of India. I would, then, earnestly remind the noble Lord that besides this excessive ratio of general taxation the people of the two Presidencies are deserving of liberal treatment, because at one period of our rule this Salt Tax did not exist in Madras and Bombay; and it was only put on because Bengal, then a lightly taxed part of India, had borne it. In the present state of the finances, I cannot expect my years of advocacy of free salt to be now accepted. But even in this dark era of finance I continue to urge that exemption. I believe that a sacrifice of the £6,500,000 which the Salt Tax yields would be a measure both politically and financially sound. The people might then justly say that they eat the salt of the great Government free of price and in abundance. The consumption of salt which would result from people and cattle using it in abundance would create a vast traffic throughout India; there is no other article which would be so generally transported as salt. Indeed, the great sources from whence salt would be obtained—I mean Bombay, Madras, Bengal, Samberlake in Central India, and the salt mines of the Punjab, are all centres from which salt would be sent to all the nooks and corners of India. I urge cheapness, by freedom from taxation, because salt would be sent in vast quantities beyond our Frontiers. Then the savage and wild tribes would be conciliated to our rule; intercourse and with it trade would expand, so that peace within and friendly feelings abroad would be created. In this recommendation I may add that I specially refer to Afghanistan and to the Russian Frontier, where the salt lakes previously supplying the Afghans with salt are now monopolized by Russia; and by this possession a serious pressure may be expected to be applied by Russia on the neighbouring people of Afghans and Turcomans. I must add that there is no measure more useful for a powerful influence on Russian aggression than that of counteracting their desire for trade. The history of Russian military progress is that of progress in trade, only the trade precedes the advance of the troops. It is the traders who spur on the advance of soldiers, and I must allow that the Russians are most persevering. In 1842, when occupying Shanghai, the artillerymen found good Russian blue cloth in the shops for a military jacket; and when I opened Shanghai for trade in 1843, the Russian cloth was then on sale, but necessarily withdrawn when our cheaper cloths came in competition. I earnestly urge that our salt and our railway charges be lessened, so as to counteract Russian trade. I am not quite satisfied with the way the noble Lord spoke of the reduction of the Sea Customs Duties. By mentioning the net amount now credited to the Income, the loss by the abolition of these duties is made to appear very large; whereas, by curtailing the gross receipts now and formerly, the difference is not so great. The discrepancy is caused by the charges for collecting the Sea Customs not being levied in ratio with the duties taken off. This is a defect which ought to have been remedied by the Secretary of State and his Council. But I may plead in favour of the wise measure of nearly making India a free port that, consequent on the removal of duties from nearly all articles of trade, the bulk of trade and its value have greatly extended, and are yearly extending, so that India is now better able to meet the annually increasing payments at home. From this view there is good cause for congratulation, and with well-deserved praise to the Marquess of Ripon and Sir Evelyn Baring, who carried into full effect the measures which were commenced by Lord Lytton and Sir John Strachey. The part of the noble Lord's speech in which I am naturally deeply interested is in regard to the roads, railways, and fortifications for the defence of our Frontier. With regard to the lines of communication, I am in favour of their being multiplied to all reasonable extent, and so laid out as to lead along the Afghan Frontier, with branches to the mouths of the Passes. I believe these Passes to be many in number, and as yet all are not known. The nature of the defensive works I am anxious about. At present the idea is conveyed from India that large forts needing the occupation of bodies of troops are intended. Besides distrusting the soundness of plans for such extensive works, I challenge the policy of standing on the defensive. I draw a distinction between great fortified places and small redoubts. The latter should be many in number to be held by small bodies of troops, and of such a size as to store ammunition and other stores for the current use of the troops immediately dependent on the depôts. I wish, however, to raise my voice against locking up large bodies of troops in big forts. I beg of the noble Lord to recall to his mind the progress of troops in Asia. The many nations—Greeks, Romans, Russians—have seldom stood on the defensive. History tells us that when the advance ceased the downfall began. Our military history of India, as well as that of Russia, teaches that the best means of defence are offensive movements. I may mention our attack on Delhi during the Mutiny as a remarkable instance of the advantage of offensive warfare. The bold measure of attacking Delhi with wholly insufficient means, as compared with the force inside Delhi, was our safety. It gave time for more troops to assemble before Delhi, so that, whilst inspiriting the people of the Punjab and dispiriting the mutineers inside Delhi, we were able by this daring attack to break the neck of the Mutiny before reinforcements arrived from home. I do not raise objections to the proposal of the noble Lord for the formation of an intrenched camp in the Pishin Valley, provided the place is healthy. I hold this opinion as being in some respect conditional on the works being such as a small body of troops could defend, and thus set free the mass of the Army for offensive operations. Our camps in India have hitherto become great cantonments, into which large numbers of Natives have flocked, no doubt with benefit to ourselves; but this advantage has been injurious by lessening the mobility of the force in camp. I advocate the extension of our camp as close to the frontier of Candahar as may be possible. It is very desirable to be able to move on Herat with promptness; and with the improvements now in progress at that fortress I have no doubt—from what Eldred Pottinger, who successfully defended Herat for 10 months did against a Russian attack—but that the troops of the Ameer could easily hold the fort till our Army reached it in succour. The most important part of the speech of the noble Lord, in a military point of view, was that relating to the Army. The improvements proposed are a Reserve, an increase of one squadron to each of the regiments of Native Cavalry of Bengal and Bombay, and to raise three additional regiments in Bengal and Bombay; also to raise five additional battalions of Goorkhas. The noble Lord also referred to the necessity of adding to our European Force, and complained of this portion of our Army having been kept incomplete to the extent of 10,000, and that £100,000 had been paid by India to induce the European soldiers entitled to discharge to volunteer to continue to serve in India. As regards this payment, I protest against India being charged. The bargain with the Home Government is to keep the Indian garrison complete and effective. This guarantee has repeatedly been broken. This failure is not special to one Party, but to all the Governments of England. The European troops in India have repeatedly fallen below their fixed strength, and at the present time there are 2,000 European Infantry wanting to complete. India made a great mistake when it confided to the War Office and Exchequer of England the sole duty of keeping up the Force required for the Indian garrison. It would be a prudent precaution to resume from the War Office the charge of the depôts and troops needed to be kept at home for the maintenance of the garrison. India could then add, at a small cost, such additional strength as may provide for the efficiency of the Forces required for the defence of India. As regards additional European troops, I advise, in preference, an improvement in the present Establishment. The Artillery batteries should be raised to eight guns, the same as those of Russia; the nine Cavalry regiments can easily be formed into three squadrons, each of 150 effective troopers; and the 50 battalions of Infantry into six companies each, with 125 effective privates in a company. The squadrons, batteries, and companies would then be much more effective in officers, non-commissioned officers, corporals, and lance corporals. Past experience has shown that in warfare in Asia the completeness of companies and squadrons is of vital importance. In the event of an increase of European troops, I suggest that independent bodies of Infantry and Cavalry should be formed. I mean that separate companies of Infantry and squadrons of Cavalry, each of 150 effective privates, be formed, with sufficient officers and other ranks, to enable them to act independently. Regiments of Cavalry and battalions of Infantry, by their organization are ill-adapted for detachment duty. I well remember Lord Clyde's last words to me in 1860, when I parted with him on his return home; he specially desired me to remind Lord Canning of the importance of discipline by calling in the then many detached European companies, to give them headquarters, and thereby maintain efficiency. With regard to the Native troops being increased, I much regret the omission of the Madras Army. But if Sir Frederick Roberts has failed, I cannot expect my words to have influence in correcting this unfairness. I do not gainsay the numerical increase of the Goorkhas; but I would have wished to have heard of the existing battalions being improved. I believe in the necessity for more European officers; on them must rest the efficiency of the Native troops in action. The late failure of the 17th Poorbeahs at Suakin may be attributed to deficiency of European officers. So also in other instances; but by making this increase the organization of the Native corps would be so improved as that their duties in India should be diminished and their training greatly bettered. There is one change which I trust will be made, and that is a considerable addition to the pay of the ranks of the Native troops. My hon. Friend the Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) stated last year that for 100 years the pay of the Native Army had not been changed. But though in the main correct, he might have said that the pay of some ranks had within the 100 years been lessened; and if the noble Lord will refer to the Accounts of 1786 in the Library of the House he will find that the rates of pay of the Native ranks of the Bengal Army were in several instances much higher than the current rate. I do not for the first time express this opinion, because after the Mutiny I entertained and made known the like opinion to Lord Canning. I did not do so in writing, because I felt that it would be advisable not to give hopes which might not be realized. My hon. Friend the Member for Orkney (Mr. Laing), then Finance Minister, approved of the increase. Some improvements were made after I left India, but not sufficient in my opinion. Since then greater need exists for this improvement, considering the additions made during the past 25 years to the pay of the European soldier. I may add that the great increase of trade has cut off from the Army many classes who made war a profession. I would also wish to see greater encouragement given to induce European officers to acquire the Frontier languages as well as those of India, the knowledge that several hundred officers had a speaking and perhaps a writing acquaintance with the Turcoman and Afghan languages would have a beneficial effect on the Russian Government. An acquaintance with the topography as well as the geography of the Frontier of Afghanistan and Russia must show that if necessary our officers could in case of need be as aggressive as the Russians have been and will be. I do not hesitate to state that the only influence that can be successfully applied to keep the Russians within bounds is a knowledge of our power to act offensively. The Germans know well that it is their great Army on the Russian Frontier which deters Russian officers from disturbing the Frontier between the two countries. I have followed with attention the financial details of the noble Lord; and though I cannot agree to the extreme views of our Expenditure, I yet consider the statement sufficiently alarming to justify anxiety, and to need all the possible economies mentioned by the noble Lord. I particularize the Civil Expenditure as worthy of control. I have repeatedly pointed out the extravagance, yearly on the increase, in this branch. From all that has been said, I understand that our preparations will require an expenditure of capital of about £10,000,000 for roads, railways, redoubts, small arms, guns, and stores; but, these once laid in, then the sum of £2,000,000 for the Army will maintain our troops in a state of great efficiency. Now, whilst warning the noble Lord against extravagant outlay on stores, I think I am justified in saying that the proposed outlay is not so large as to frighten us—at all events, as the noble Lord is young, I am confident that he will not become faint of heart.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India had proved that he was a Rupert of Debate, and he would have shown himself a great power in regard to financial matters if he had confined himself to a Financial Statement, and to the eloquent appeal he had made on behalf of India for the sympathetic interest of Englishmen in Indian affairs. If the noble Lord had confined himself to the observations he had made upon those points, he (Sir George Campbell) would have had nothing but praise and coincidence of opinion to express. But he must say it did seem to him to be a pity that the noble Lord should have employed his genius with such brilliancy, and, he might almost say, with such effect, in a bad cause. It was much to be regretted that the noble Lord had attacked the Marquess of Ripon as he had done. The comparison he had drawn between Lord Lytton and the Marquess of Ripon was a very unhappy one, for whatever the faults of the Marquess of Ripon were—and every man had his faults—and although he might have been imprudent in parting too hastily with the resources of the country, whatever fault might be found with him for the sacrifice he had made of the finances of India, and in not making adequate provision for the protection of the North-West Frontier, the Marquess of Ripon was by no means a sleepy man. If he had been sleepy in regard to the North-West Frontier, and in some other respects, his policy was infinitely preferable to that of Lord Lytton, who had involved them in an expensive war that cost £20,000,000, and had probably brought about their present complications with Russia. Those complications were due, in a great measure, to their attacks upon Afghanistan, and to the hatred which had been engendered against them among the Afghan tribes in consequence. He thought that Lord Lytton had been most unfortunate and unwise in bringing about that Campaign. He would always maintain the opinion that that war was wrong and unjustifiable. Therefore, if the noble Lord objected to the policy of the Marquess of Ripon in connection with the North-West Frontier, that could hardly be regarded as an unmitigated evil, and the Marquess of Ripon had undoubtedly turned Lord Lytton's constant deficits into surpluses; he had materially developed the resources of India, and had succeeded in securing the goodwill of the people of that country. He (Sir George Campbell) maintained that it was much better to pursue a policy of that kind in employing the finances of India, than in guarding against dangers which had not yet arrived. There was another point in which the Secretary of State seemed to contradict himself. He had taunted the Marquess of Ripon with having rashly abandoned the resources of the country, whereas he claimed credit to Lord Lytton for having so dealt with the Customs Duties of India that the first of Lord Lytton's Successors was compelled to abandon them altogether. He could not understand how it was that the noble Lord looked upon a policy of that kind as a matter in which Lord Lytton deserved praise, while, at the same time, he censured the Marquess of Ripon for getting rid of the Customs Revenue of India. He (Sir George Campbell) was inclined to think that the policy of the Marquess of Ripon, even in regard to the North-West Frontier, was far preferable to the King Stork policy of his Predecessor. He was afraid that some day or other Party politics in this country would exercise a dangerous influence in India. The noble Lord wound up his speech by expressing confidence in the resources of India; but the noble Lord's statement in regard to Indian finance was an extremely gloomy one. He had told the Committee that there was not only a large deficit at the present time, but that they must expect to have deficits for the future. He was afraid that the noble Lord was right in that assertion; and although he did not blame the noble Lord, who had only been six weeks in Office, for not grappling with this great and difficult problem, it was certainly contrary to all sound financial principles to make no provision for the present deficit, but merely to carry it forward to next year. No doubt the noble Lord had not yet had time to consider the matter fully; but he hoped that when he had had time to apply his mind to the subject he would come to the conclusion, next year, that it was not right to hand over a deficit from one year to another without any attempt to provide for it. He was glad to hear the noble Lord express a strong opinion that there should be a Parliamentary inquiry into the affairs of India. He (Sir George Campbell) certainly thought there ought to be a full and thorough inquiry, and he endorsed the arguments of the noble Lord in favour of inquiry. His only doubt was whether it should be a strictly Parliamentary inquiry, or whether it should not be an inquiry by Royal Commission on which they might be able to appoint some of the best and strongest men in the country. He (Sir George Campbell) strongly deprecated any policy which would involve the conversion of the difficulties of India into Party questions; and he certainly thought that if the Secretary of State in future was to follow the example of the noble Lord and make such a bitter attack upon former Viceroys very serious difficulties and dangers might result. He was sorry that he had incited the indignation of the noble Lord, because he had happened to laugh when the noble Lord used the somewhat novel phrase of "Britain and Ireland." He wished to say at once that he had no intention of deriding the influence of Irishmen in Indian affairs. On the contrary, he agreed with the noble Lord in thinking that India had derived very great benefit from the services of Irishmen; he would be most ungrateful if he were not to admit that India owed very much to Irishmen. He himself, in the work he had been able to do in India, owed very much to the assistance he had received from Irishmen; and it had often struck him that there was something connected with the tenure of land in Ireland which made Irishmen peculiarly useful in India. There had been no Viceroy in whose labours he had had greater sympathy, and who had administered the Government of India to greater advantage to the country, than the Earl of Mayo, under whom he had served a good many years ago. He believed that the Viceroyalty of the Earl of Mayo in India was one of the best Administrations that had ever existed in that country. The Earl of Mayo was an Irishman, and at that moment there was a very large proportion of Irishmen in the Indian Service. Many of the great reforms which had been carried out in the Province of Bengal had been mainly due to Irishmen, and they were at that moment assisting the present Lieutenant Governor of Bengal in a most excellent and admirable manner. He hoped that after those remarks the noble Lord would acquit him of ingratitude towards Irishmen for their services in India. He thoroughly acknowledged the justice of what the noble Lord had said, that if there was to be a Parliamentary inquiry into the machinery of Government in India and the administration of affairs in that country, note must be taken of the opinion of the educated Native men to whom the noble Lord had referred. They were persons whose opinions ought to be fully understood, and who were entitled to be listened to. Indeed, too great weight could not be attached to the representation of the views of the Native population of India. He trusted that all classes of the people of India would be represented in the coming inquiry, and that they would be fully and fairly heard. As regarded the immediate question of Indian finance, he confessed that he had always been something of a pessimist, and he had often expressed doubts as to the propriety of the fair-weather policy which had been pursued. He was of opinion that they had not sufficiently provided for a time of great difficulty and disturbance. A time of disturbance had now arrived, and he could not say that he had been altogether unprepared for the gloomy view which the noble Lord took of Indian affairs. He had always thought that too much had been made of the Russian scare; but a period of difficulty had now come upon them, and already the country had been put to an enormous expense in that direction. It was better for the country to be called upon to spend money now rather than to have spent it prematurely some years ago. The position of Afghanistan was a very large and difficult question, and he would not attempt to discuss it at the present moment. He would only say that, as a matter of history, it was a hazardous policy to attempt to set up Afghanistan as a Kingdom. There would always be a great danger in having a country like that between our territory and that of a powerful European nation; with one side turned towards us, and the other towards Russia. In this matter England, he said, had shown that she was sensitive, and Russia had taken advantage of it. He entirely agreed with the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India that it was desirable that they should now strengthen their Indian Frontier; but he hoped the noble Lord would bear in mind the warnings of Indian military officers on that subject, and he also hoped that the experience which Members of the present Government had had with respect to Afghanistan would counsel them to free the country as much as possible from the difficulties which would result from having to do with that nest of hornets. He agreed with the noble Lord that the Indian Army must be permanently strengthened. He had always said that the Indian Army was very small for the vast Dominion, population, and interests which it had to protect and control; and now that their Indian Empire was almost in contact with that of Russia he said it was absolutely indispensable that the Indian Army should be increased. He would not, however, detain the Committee on that question, with which he did not feel himself fully competent to deal. But he did say that it was a right move to establish a Native Army Reserve in India. He had always found and urged that the old Native soldiers and pensioners were very trustworthy and reliable men, and he believed that they would be their best aid in time of difficulty in the country, and constitute a source of strength there; and, therefore, as far as he could judge, the proposal seemed to be a wise and proper one so far as the Infantry were concerned. With regard to the Cavalry, he was not quite so sure—indeed, he had always thought that the Cavalry in India were a very expensive and not very valuable force. He was rather inclined to think that the proper thing to be done was to mobilize the Infantry and keep up a force so equipped that they would be easily movable in time of need. But then there was the question of money. An increase of men meant, of course, an increased expenditure, and he agreed with the remarks of the hon. and gallant Gentleman (General Sir George Balfour) who had just spoken in saying that the pay of the Native soldiers was insufficient. There could be no doubt that a very large additional expenditure of money would be necessary, and the question was, how was that expenditure to be provided for. The noble Lord had laid great stress on reduction and economy. No one more than himself desired to see that there should be both reduction and economy; but it was always to be remembered that however they reduced expenditure on the one side there were always fresh demands to meet the growing expenses on the other. But the noble Lord had spoken of a reduction on account of Public Works paid for out of Revenue. He did not agree with the noble Lord in the views he had expressed with regard to that subject, which was one concerning which he had, in his opinion, made an entirely false comparison between the administration of Lord Lytton and the administration of the Marquess of Ripon. What Lord Lytton had done was to stop during the Afghan War all the useful public works that were going forward in India. They knew that that could only be the source of temporary reduction, and Lord Lytton had stopped those great works in the most unfortunate way; because, in order to carry them out, large establishments had been created and maintained; and Lord Lytton, by stopping them suddenly, had those large establishments thrown upon his hands. When the reduction took place an enormous increase of expenditure was incurred for pensions and gratuities and other matters inseparable from operations of the kind; and in the end, when after two or three years the India Government was obliged to carry on the public works, the establishment had to be again increased at an additional cost. Therefore, it seemed to him that to stop the carrying out of public works was a thoughtless, uneconomical, and wrong manner of proceeding. It seemed to him that in the carrying out of large public works they ought, so to speak, to cut the coat according to the cloth, and that if they desired to carry them on at all they should do so at a uniform rate with a uniform establishment, and not indulge in a policy of see-saw—that was to say, a policy of reducing them at one time and increasing them at another, as was the case under the administration of Lord Lytton before that of the Marquess of Ripon began. Roads, bridges, irrigation works, and works of that kind were things that if they were started to-day must be carried on to-morrow; and, therefore, he did not agree with the policy indicated by the noble Lord. He was also of opinion that the policy of cutting down the Provincial Budgets was a most disastrous policy, because by so doing he believed they could not have efficiency and justice to those Departments. When he was in Bengal he, being inclined to economy and prudence, had saved a good deal of money against a rainy day; but when the famine came the whole of the savings were swept away. What was the result? His Successor spent every farthing of Revenue, and there was nothing saved at all. He agreed in thinking that the statement of the noble Lord, and the statement of Sir Auckland Colvin, Finance Minister, were very gloomy indeed, notwithstanding the hopeful expressions with which the noble Lord had concluded his speech. He had read the statement of Sir Auckland Colvin, and he found that, while it alluded to the reduction of Revenue, it did not make any reference to increased taxation. But he thought they would be obliged to resort to that. But he (Sir George Campbell) said that if the Licence Tax was extended, they would have, honestly, to make it an Income Tax, because that was a tax which would hit the rich as well as the poor, even if they did not go the length of having a graduated Income Tax, under which the rich out of their possessions should pay more than the poor in their poverty. He had often commented on the policy which abolished the Import Duties on Manchester goods; and as long as the Rice Duty remained as it was, he, for one, would not have sacrificed those duties. With regard to the Salt Tax, he considered that it was impossible to increase that; he said it was a delusion to speak of that tax as having been very much reduced. The Salt Tax, as a whole, had not been reduced, but equalized, and was very heavy still. If they compared the Revenue from that source with what it was a few years ago, it would be seen that, while in one part of India it had been largely increased, in another part it had been correspondingly diminished. The noble Lord, in making a comparison of the present Revenue of India with what it was 10 years ago, had spoken of the elasticity of the Indian Revenue. He (Sir George Campbell) had heard a good deal about that before; but when he came to the figures that had been laid before them that day, he could not help remarking that the whole increase of £2,000,000 found to have arisen in 10 years was due to the increase in Public Works alone. The net increase on those works was £2,000,000.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Lord Randolph Churchill): The amount charged as increase of Revenue on Public Works is £566,000. The two must be taken together.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL: Exactly; and the result was that there was no increase of Revenue at all, except from this source. Now, with regard to the Accounts. The noble Lord's speech had been devoted to high finance and politics; but he must ask the Committee to come down a little and consider the Accounts. He wished to express the opinion that he had expressed many times before, that the Accounts were presented to the House in far too complicated a form. It was almost impossible for Members of Parliament, save those who took an active interest in Indian affairs, to understand them. In these Accounts everything was stated in gross; items were included under the head of Revenue which were not Revenue at all, but sources of Expenditure, and they also mixed up Imperial with Provincial finance in a manner which had led to a great deal of confusion. He would illustrate his remarks by referring to one item—namely, the Public Works. There was the statement that under that head there was an estimated surplus of £566,000; but when they came to look into the matter they found that the whole surplus disappeared and became a deficit, because there was the loss on Exchange, which for 1884-5 was £1,873,000, and for 1885-6 £1,900,000. Those things were stated in the Accounts in a manner so misleading as to suggest a surplus, while a deficit really existed. He did not say that there was a real loss, but they must not run away with the belief that there was a surplus in hard cash. Then there was the subject of railways, to which the noble Lord had devoted a short portion of his speech. He (Sir George Campbell) had always been in favour of a liberal extension of railways in India; he thought that where there were no proper roads, and where road-making was expensive, the railways might with great advantage be extended considerably. But he looked with alarm on the present programme with regard to railways put forward by the Indian Works Department. The gentleman who was responsible for that had set his teeth on the construction of certain railways in India; and great care was, in his opinion, necessary in order to insure that his scheme should not be sanctioned *en bloc.* He found, by the

Finance Minister's Statement, that he expected to spend in 1885-6 upwards of £8,000,000 on railways upon State responsibility, apart from those railways which were constructed by private enterprize. That seemed to him to be a very large sum; it greatly exceeded the amount which the Committee of the House of Commons contemplated would be so expended, and he thought that the proposal must be regarded with concern by all. He admitted that the policy of the Earl of Dalhousie, who mapped out an extensive scheme of State Guaranteed Railways, had been in the main a success. The State had paid very dearly for it, however; but, although the railways had probably cost double what they might have cost, he considered they were worth the money spent upon them. But now that they had gained so much experience in those matters, and had an enormous establishment capable of making railways, with men experienced in their construction, he doubted very much that it was the true policy to employ those guaranteed contractors in the work. The Government ought especially to have control over the railway rates. He was one of those who thought that the rates charged by the Railway Companies in India were not nearly cheap enough. He contended that they would not do justice to the trade and resources of India until they had a system under which they could reduce the railway charges to a minimum. His experience was that railways must always be to a great extent monopolies; and if they were to have the present system and not trust to private enterprize—if the Government were to guarantee interest and debt, it would be much better that they should have complete control, so that there might not be undue competition on one side, and monopoly on the other. He was not certain that they had gained the desired object by submitting themselves to the conditions which the promoters of certain guaranteed lines had imposed on them. They might be very good and able men; but when a promoter was disposing of other people's money he was not always as careful as he ought to be. He did not like promoters to handle Government money, and, as he had said, he preferred that the system should be laid down by the Government. There was between Calcutta and Madras a part of India still unexplored, and which was to that day in the possession of the Aborigines. He thought it would be right for the State —cautiously, of course—to develop a railway in that district, but not too fast. He hoped that would not be lost sight of by the noble Lord. It was only the other day that he put a Question in the House with reference to another line of railway; but the only answer he received was that the noble Lord traversed all the facts and circumstances—there was no reply to his Question. He asked whether, in view of the depressed condition of Indian trade, and in view of the great difficulties of Indian finance, the Government were going to guarantee lines which would compete with the Government lines already established? He thought the new line would come into direct opposition with the East India Railway on the one side, and with other railways on the other side. It would interfere with their through traffic, and seriously injure the other lines. He did not know whether the noble Lord had applied his acute mind to the subject of railways in America; but if he had he would see that the through lines had of late years been cutting each other's throats in consequence of this competition for traffic—he referred to the lines running from the coast to the centre of the country. No doubt the public got the benefit, but it certainly seemed to be a suicidal policy so far as the railways themselves were concerned. He hoped that state of things would not be repeated in India, and that the noble Lord would take care that he did not yield too much to the promoters of those lines. As those railways were a very important subject, he thought it right to say as much as this with regard to them; but there were a lot of other matters of importance in connection with Indian finance, the details of which he would not attempt to go into. He would only say this—that if the noble Lord were in Office another year, and he hoped that he would not be in Office unless he joined the Radicals, and he had some hopes of that, he trusted he would apply his genius to the subject of Indian finance. If he did, no doubt great benefit would result; but he also felt that the task was one of enormous difficulty. It appeared to him that the noble Lord in his speech that night had made out the difficulties and dangers of Indian finance a good deal more strikingly than he had made out the bright side of the case. If he were in Office next year, it would not do for him to tide over his difficulties by balances and loans; but he would find it necessary to have to resort in some shape or other to increased taxation or to Revenue to meet the deficit which would exist. At any rate, he (Sir George Campbell) felt that this question was a very difficult and gloomy one, and he hoped that whoever was in Office he would attempt to grapple with the question.

CAPTAIN AYLMER said, he desired to say a few words with reference to the new Frontier railways designed in India. Hon. Members had recently had a map of the approved new Frontier lines placed in their hands by the Government; and he begged to call the attention of the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India, or his Representative at the present moment in the House, to two lines, and matters connected with them which he considered of vital importance. There were two distinct lines, one running South from Rawul Pindi and Kohat to Dehra Ismael Khan on the Indus, and the other running North from Mooltan to near the Indus nearly opposite Dehra Ismael Khan. There was no connection between those lines. They ran parallel with their Frontier, and, therefore, were probably the most difficult lines to defend. It was absolutely necessary, where a line of railway ran parallel with a Frontier, that the access to both extremes should be perfectly easy, because if the line was cut by an enemy at the North, and access to the South was rendered impossible by reason of a river intervening, the line, instead of being useful, was absolutely a danger. A bridge, therefore, over the Indus, connecting the line at Dehra Ismael Khan with the line opposite, was absolutely necessary. He also, having carefully studied the question, wished to call particular attention to another railway proposed by the Government—namely, the Quetta Railway, through the Pishin Valley. That line, begun in 1879 and 1880 by the Government of the late Earl of Beaconsfield, was stopped when the late Government came into power. In October, 1883, they, however, had given orders that it should be commenced again, and the coolness with which they looked upon the line in 1880 turned to red heat in January, 1884. In such hot haste did they recommence the line that at one time from 15,000 to 20,000 men were employed upon it, and during the whole of 1884 something like 17,000 men were employed upon it, and now they were told by the noble Lord that the line could not be completed till 1886. The noble Lord had made that statement the other day in answer to a Question addressed to him. If an ordinary amount of attention had been paid to it, and an ordinary amount of strength had been put upon it during those years, it would have been completed by this; but he (Captain Aylmer) was now informed by those who were constructing it that there was no possibility of its being completed so soon in consequence of the unhealthiness of the working men being unable to do anything on the lower end in the summer, or anything on the upper end in the winter. Turning from that, however, he wished to ask Her Majesty's Government to consider one point—namely, that, instead of stopping at Shibo as it was proposed to do at present, they should go 20 miles further to the top of the Kojak Range. The distance, as he said, was only about 20 miles; but it was a difficult piece of railway work, and if it were left until war actually broke out it would be almost impossible to construct it. But from the top of the Kojak Pass to Candahar would be a very simple piece of work—the gradient was an easy one. He would strongly recommend that to Her Majesty's Government. There was a more important point still to be dealt with The line from Quetta came down to the Indus to join the Mooltan line; but it did not join it, because a bridge was required. That bridge had been contemplated, and plans had been prepared. It had been designed. The engineer whose work it was seemed to have been desirous of having in it the greatest span of any bridge in the world. The piers had all been laid, and, at the present moment, they were unable to find a contractor who would undertake the making of the bridge. The necessity for that bridge was very great. During the grain season, when produce was coming down from the North-West Provinces, at the present moment, owing to the want of continuous railway communication, it had to be taken across the Indus in barges and then placed again on the railway for transit to Kurrachee, and this could only be accomplished by using the electric light. He would urge upon the Government the desirability of attempting to modify the model of the bridge, as no contractor would undertake its construction in its present form. Now he came to even a more important point than either of those two which he had already touched upon—namely, the necessity of at once building a bridge over the Indus from Sukkur to Rohree. Without it the Lahore and Delhi railways would be entirely cut off from the railways on the Afghan side of the Indus. Without that bridge there could be no possible connection in any way, by railway or otherwise, between the Bombay or Madras Presidencies and the railways on the Afghanistan side. Any Army operating on the Frontier would simply be protecting one-half of India, leaving the other half in the cold; and it would be evident that the difficulties of transhipment and carrying it from one side of the river to the other would be very great. Finally, when the Sukkur and Rohree Bridge was completed it would be necessary to make from the Indian end of the bridge a line to Ahmatebad on the Rajpootana Railway, as without it the Bombay and Madras Army would be entirely cut off from operating in Afghanistan. With that railway a Bombay or Madras Army would be equally serviceable on the Frontier as a Bengal Army. He only wished to call attention to those matters, and he was sure that, having done so, the noble Lord would bear them in mind.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Although the appearance of the Committee is not very encouraging for the purpose—that is, to induce one to make many lengthened observations—I am unwilling that the debate should close without entering somewhat a protest against the unusual course that has been adopted by the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India in making his Statement on Indian Finance. The noble Lord, in the course of his speech, the ability of which I fully recognize, took the opportunity of interpolating some remarks which I am of opinion ought not to have found a place in a Financial Statement, and which were rather such as should have been made in a speech supporting a Vote of Censure on the late Viceroy and the late Administration of India. I think it is an extremely inconvenient and an extremely unfortunate course that observations of that sort, and an attack such as was made by the noble Lord, should have been introduced into an Indian Financial Statement. It has been the endeavour hitherto of those who are responsible for the Government of India in this House to avoid, on this occasion, at all events as much as possible, the introduction of controversial and Party politics. The occasion has been one upon which we have all endeavoured to elucidate, as far as possible, the facts of Indian finance; and it has been an occasion upon which various more or less valuable suggestions have been made by those who have had experience in Indian affairs, and the debate on the Indian Financial Statement has not generally shown any tendency whatever to degenerate into Party controversy. Well, Sir, I should think it very unfortunate if the practice were permanently departed from; and I think it would be very unfortunate indeed if the attention of the Committee were to be hereafter diverted from the facts and considerations bearing upon Indian finance to topics which, however interesting, are not, in my opinion, greatly calculated to conduce to the elucidation of this subject. But if topics of this sort are to be introduced, I think the Committee will understand that it would only be fair that they should be introduced after some fair warning and some fair notice given to those who are concerned in their discussion. When a Vote of Censure is proposed upon the conduct of any branch of the Administration—when a Government is attacked in respect of any part of its policy, that Government has at hand all the resources of official information; it has all the resources of its Offices behind it, and it is always more or less prepared to reply to any attack that can be made upon it. No Vote of Censure, according to my recollection, is ever proposed, and no attack is ever made upon a Government Department without previous Notice being given in this House, and to those against whom the attack is directed, in order to afford them an opportunity of preparing a defence to that attack. Well, Sir, that course has not been followed upon this occasion. Neither in public nor in private has the noble Lord thought fit to give the slightest intimation, as far as I am aware, either to the Marquess of Ripon, or to the late Secretary of State for India (the Earl of Kimberley), or the late Under Secretary (Mr. J. K. Cross), or to myself, who have been partially responsible for Indian administration, of his intention to arraign on this unusual occasion a great part of the policy of the Indian Government during the last five years. That seems to me to be a course of which I and my Friends have a right to complain. I do not, however, complain of it very much on personal grounds, because the Marquess of Ripon and the Earl of Kimberley, and other officials whose conduct has been attacked to-night, will have other opportunities, if they think it necessary to take advantage of them, which they can create for themselves to vindicate their reputation, and to reply in detail to the criticisms that have been passed upon them which I protest against. The reason why I think it necessary to protest against the course taken this evening concerns the public interest. I think that if attacks of this kind are to be made on such occasions as this it will be an inconvenient and unfortunate deviation from the ordinary practice. It would be far more consistent with the public interest that these attacks should be made after such Notice as would enable a reply to be given at the same time as the attack, so that the House and the country might judge without delay between those who attack and those who are placed on the defensive. I certainly do not intend to attempt to enter into a full vindication of that part of the policy of the Marquess of Ripon which has been arraigned by the noble Lord to-night. I have not the materials by me which would enable me to do so, and I have not had the opportunity of consulting recently with either the Marquess of Ripon or the Earl of Kimberley on these subjects; and I do not desire to enter upon what at the very best would be but a partial reply to the noble Lord. There are, however, one or two topics which the noble Lord has touched upon with regard to which it might be well that I should make one or two brief observations. The noble Lord entirely disapproved, as we were already aware that he did, the policy of the late Government in withdrawing from Candahar and in not completing the railway. Well, Sir, as to that, it might be sufficient for me to say that whatever may be the merits of our policy in that respect, we are not alone responsible for that. The subject was fully brought before the attention of Parliament, and, after a long debate, Parliament approved our conduct and made itself responsible for our policy.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL): That policy was not before the House.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: All the facts were known to Parliament at the time of the withdrawal from Candahar. But I do not rest my case entirely upon the sanction given to our policy by Parliament. I believe now, as fully as I did at the time of the debate, that the policy followed by us was the right one, and I feel the strongest conviction that we should not be in the slightest degree in a better position to defend ourselves against any aggressive steps on the part of Russia towards India if that policy had not been followed. The noble Lord said that we are likely to be called upon to make in the present and succeeding years very great exertions, and to be involved in considerable pecuniary sacrifices. That is extremely probable and likely. I do not in the least deny it; but the fact that we are likely to have to make such exertions does not in the least prove that we should have been in a better position to make these exertions or incur these pecuniary sacrifices if we had spent two or three previous years in wasting money upon useless and unprofitable enterprizes. We believe that the continued occupation of Candahar would not only not have strengthened our position against any aggression on the part of Russia, but would have actually weakened our means of defence against such aggression. Whatever value may be attached to our alliance with Afghanistan—and I quite admit we could not base the safety of India entirely on the friendship of the Afghans—we held in 1881, and we hold still, that the love of the Afghans of independence, and the resistance which they are sure to offer to any attack from Russia upon that independence, are amongst the most important factors at our disposal for resisting any aggressive

Russian designs against India, and we believe now, as we believed in 1881, that the possession and retention of Candahar, the annexation of Candahar, the paring away from the Afghan territory of one of the richest parts of it, would have inevitably and unalterably and permanently alienated all chance of the friendship of the Afghans from us. It was not within our power to undo all the mischief which had been done by the Governments of Lord Lytton and Viscount Cranbrook. It was not in our power to undo all the consequences of the war which, in our opinion, was unnecessarily waged by the Government of Lord Lytton on the people of Afghanistan. We are not in the slightest degree surprised to find even now the Afghan people, to a certain extent, suspicious, unfriendly, and jealous, and not disinclined to believe that we may harbour intentions towards them quite as hostile as any which the Russian Government may itself harbour. But that is not the consequence of the policy we have pursued. It is the consequence of the war that was waged by Lord Lytton —a policy which the noble Lord has thought fit to praise to-night. We did what we could to undo the effects of that unfortunate policy, and we believe the most important part of our action was retiring from Candahar to prove to the Afghans that we had no aggressive intentions against them. The noble Lord says that for five years we have seen Russia advancing in the direction of India, and that the Indian Government has taken no notice of that advance. He says that during this time the Marquess of Ripon and the Indian Government have been wrapped in slumber. Whatever may have been the defects of the policy of the Marquess of Ripon and his advisers, does the noble Lord or the Committee think that we should be in a better position to resist Russian aggression if we had wasted the resources of India and of this country during the last four years in a series of unprofitable wars with Afghanistan? And what guarantee will the noble Lord give us that if this policy of retaining possession of Candahar had been adopted we should not have been engaged in these wars? The noble Lord says it was a mistake to retire from Candahar.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL): I particularly said I would not on this occasion raise any question as to the policy of the abandonment of Candahar.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: The noble Lord said he would not raise the question; but I heard the observations he made, and, in my opinion, they did raise the question of the mistake which he held had been committed in our retirement from Candahar. I say that that policy was right. We did not in the first instance retire from Candahar; we found ourselves committed to some extent to certain engagements which had been made by our Predecessors. We did not retire from these engagements until the circumstances had changed. But the retention of a Force in the neighbourhood of Candahar by the late Government led to a renewal of conflicts between the Afghans and the British Forces—between Ayoob Khan and ourselves. It is impossible for the noble Lord or his Friends to deny that if the policy we adopted in 1881 in withdrawing from Candahar had not been adopted we might have found ourselves engaged in a succession of these wars and in a succession of hostilities with the Afghan people. Well, Sir, therefore we consider that the policy we adopted in that respect is one which certainly would not diminish our power of self-defence against Russian aggression, but, on the contrary, would greatly increase it. The noble Lord has said that the suspension of railway communication with Quetta was bad policy. Now, the temporary suspension of that railway—for, as my hon. Friend (Mr. J. K. Cross) the other day showed, the railway was, all but a small portion of it, again taken up—was a part of the same policy and was dictated by those considerations which induced us to abandon Candahar; and, notwithstanding the contradiction of the noble Lord just now, we say that that was a policy which was before the House when the whole question was debated. We felt at that time, rightly or wrongly, that the announcement that the Indian Government had determined permanently to retain the district of Pishin would have an effect on the mind and temper of the Afghan people similar to the retention of Candahar—of the same character, though not, perhaps, so pronounced. We believed, from the best information obtainable at the time, that the Pishin district formed a part of Afghanistan, and we believed that the retention or permanent occupation of that district would be considered by the Afghan people as a plain sign and indication of our intention to make further aggression on Afghan territory, and to establish a footing in Afghanistan which could be further advanced if occasion served. Therefore, while not insisting peremptorily on withdrawal, as in the case of Candahar, we intimated to the Indian Government that in our opinion it would not be desirable to announce any intention of framing their policy upon the permanent retention of the district of Pishin. But a large discretion was given to the Indian Government as to the time when the withdrawal from Pishin should take place. The Indian Government urged reasons why that withdrawal should not be a hasty or precipitate one. No pressure was placed on the Indian Government, and the retirement from Pishin was postponed; but it was found in practice that the occupation of that district was quietly acquiesced in by the Afghan people and the Afghan Ruler. The Home Government did not put any pressure on the Indian Government to retire, and so the occupation has practically continued to the present time. As long as there was any doubt whether the district of Pishin should be permanently retained or not it would have been unwise to have proceeded with the railway. The completion of the railway was suspended pending the decision whether the district was to be permanently occupied or not; but no final decision as to the abandonment of that railway was ever announced, and it was open to the Indian Government, whenever it thought fit, to renew the proposal for the construction of that railway. When the time arrived that it was thought necessary for the safety of India that the railway should be further extended, that proposal was made by the Indian Government; no opposition was given to it by the Government at home, and the extension of the Pishin Railway was undertaken. But it does not appear to me to be at all clear, if the railway had been pushed on earlier, that it would not have been taken by the Afghans as an indication of aggressive intentions on our part, and would not have led to a renewal of those mischiefs and misfortunes which had been caused by the attack on Afghanistan, and which had only been partly removed by our retirement from Candahar. Then the noble Lord says that, notwithstanding the continued advance of the Russians, and the dangers that were threatening India during the whole of his administration, the Marquess of Ripon reduced the Native Army. I would like to ask the noble Lord whether he read the Report of the important Commission on the Indian Army, of which Sir Frederick Roberts, Sir John Strachey, and others of high authority were prominent members? I believe, though I have not had an opportunity of referring to the Report of that Commission during this discussion, that that Commission, at the instance of Sir Frederick Roberts, proposed a much larger diminution of the Indian Army than was adopted by the Indian Government or sanctioned at home. And when the noble Lord makes the reduction of the Indian Army a subject of charge against the Marquess of Ripon, I would ask him whether he has obtained the authority of any Indian military expert for the assumption that the efficiency of the Indian Army has been impaired by this reduction? On the contrary, I believe it is held that the reductions have been made in the less efficient and less warlike portions of the Native Army, and that the efficiency of the more valuable and more fighting portions of that Army has been increased by the measures taken by the Marquess of Ripon's Government. And I should like to suggest for the consideration of the noble Lord that, while he is increasing the strength of the Native Cavalry and the Ghoorka regiments, and taking other measures which I do not desire to call in question, and when he is considering the additional expense thrown on the Indian resources by these measures, I would like to suggest to him that it is desirable again to recur to the recommendations of that Commission, and see whether a portion of the additional expense that will be incurred by these measures might not be met by some reductions of the less efficient and less valuable portions of the Native Army. Then the noble Lord says that the Marquess of Ripon and the Government at home allowed a deficiency of 10,000 men to exist in the British garrisons in India. The noble Lord must be perfectly aware that the existence of that deficiency was no part of the Marquess of Ripon's policy. The Marquess of Ripon and the Indian Government constantly remonstrated against it. The deficiency was caused, as every military Member of the House is aware, by the changes which took place in the administration of the Army at home, and by a miscalculation made as to the establishment necessary to provide proper reliefs for the Army in India. The very first thing I did when I assumed the administration of the War Office, finding that there was a very considerable deficiency in the Army in India, was to take measures, in concert with the Government of India, for repairing that deficiency — measures which have been to a considerable extent successful, and which it may be reasonably hoped will in a short time fill up the deficiency. Therefore, I say, it is extremely unfair to charge the Marquess of Ripon with a deliberate failure of his duties in regard to the deficiency in the British garrison, which it must be admitted for a time occurred. Now, the noble Lord has also attacked the financial policy of the Marquess of Ripon. He has said that, notwithstanding the threatening symptoms to which he adverted, the Marquess of Ripon's Government did not sufficiently insist upon economy, and that it made unwise remissions of taxation. The noble Lord will not be able to find any want of attention to economy so far as the Indian Government could effect it. What I suppose the noble Lord refers to is that on the return of peace and prosperity and increase of Revenue the arrangements which were made with the Provincial Governments were reverted to, and, in some cases, the original agreements with the Provincial Governments were revised upon more liberal terms. In fact, the policy that had been instituted by the Earl of Mayo, and which received the complete approval of Lord Lytton and Sir John Strachey, was reverted to, and a considerable sum was placed by the Government of India at the disposal of the Local Governments for the improvement of their administration and the development of the resources of the Provinces. Sir, I believe that that was a wise measure. I believe that a niggardly policy in India will never be a prosperous or permanently economical policy. I believe that what we have to rely upon, to a great extent, for the future finances of India, is the development of the resources of the Local Administrations, and that if the Local Administrations were too much starved in the expenditure of the funds they consider necessary for the development of the Provinces, it would be in vain to hope for an elastic or an increasing Revenue. Well, then, Sir, as to the remission of taxation, the noble Lord says that we reduced to an unwise extent the Customs Duty. That subject was one that was fully discussed in this House, and the policy was deliberately adopted by the Indian Government after full consideration. I believe that no wiser policy could have been adopted. It was a policy that Sir John Strachey, under Lord Lytton, had advocated. If there is anything satisfactory in Indian finance it is the gradual reduction which has taken place during a very considerable number of years in the charge which falls upon the Indian Revenue in respect of the interest of capital expended on public works. The right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. E. Stanhope) is perfectly well acquainted with the burdens upon Indian finances. But what has produced this great change, this great reduction of the burdens upon India? It has been the increased receipts from Indian railways, owing to the development of the resources of the country—owing to the increase of industry and trade in India. I maintain that it was a wise policy when the Government found itself in possession of a disposable surplus to relieve still further the strings of Indian industry, and to do that which must inevitably have the effect of increasing the trade of India, and thereby of increasing that Revenue which is derived from the receipts from railways constructed by the Government. That was the foundation of the policy of 1882-3. I believe that it was a wise policy; and I should like to know whether the noble Lord and his Colleagues think that policy, which was always advocated by the Marquess of Salisbury and Lord Lytton and by Sir John Strachey, ought not to have been adopted when the Government of India found itself in possession of means to adopt it; or whether he considers that we ought to have continued, during a period of prosperity, to resort to the old methods of taxation—methods which had been condemned by every Indian financier of eminence? The noble Lord also introduced into his speech a subject which I cannot conceive had any relation to the Indian financial question. The noble Lord said that the policy of giving to Natives of India a larger share in the administration, and a more effective control of their own affairs, was a wise and intelligent policy; but he objected to the policy pursued by the Marquess of Ripon, because he said it was a stupid policy. It is quite impossible to argue against adjectives such as those employed by the noble Lord. The question was brought forward and discussed in the House, and I believe that the policy of the Marquess of Ripon, and the mode in which it was adopted, has received the assent of the House, and of the vast majority of the people outside this House. Will the noble Lord undertake to say that any considerable advance in the direction of carrying out that which he himself described as a wise and intelligent policy without raising a very strong and determined opposition from a very large section of Europeans in India—

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL): Will the noble Marquess permit me to say that, with regard to the adjectives he has referred to, I only used words identical with what is the universal opinion among Natives and Europeans in India.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: That is a very wide and very sweeping statement. I do not deny that there was a very strong and bitter and a very unwise and unscrupulous resistance from a large proportion of the Europeans, both official and non-official, in India, and I do not deny that there may have been a certain number of Native Indians with whom the noble Lord was thrown in contact, moving in Anglo-Indian society, who shared very much their impressions and opinions. But, in my opinion, if the noble Lord had inquired further as to the manner in which the Marquess of Ripon's policy had been received by the vast mass of the people he would have arrived at a different conclusion. I believe there are many men of large Indian experience who have been struck by the enthusiasm by which the policy of the Marquess of Ripon was received by large masses of Indian people. The demonstrations which have been made in his honour at the conclusion of his Viceroyalty were considered, I believe, to be the most remarkable demonstrations of Indian public opinion which have been known within our recollection. I doubt very much the assertion of the noble Lord, and contend that there is no large body of public opinion which considers that the measures taken were injudicious in themselves, or were carried out in an injudicious manner. Now, I have not attempted, nor do I intend, to make any complete reply to the attack which has been made by the noble Lord this evening. The tactics pursued by the noble Lord on this occasion have made any complete reply impossible. If it should be thought necessary, however, by those whose conduct has been impugned, an opportunity will, no doubt, be found on some future occasion. That which I principally desire to do upon the present occasion is to enter my protest—first, against the introduction of matter which I have described into the Indian Financial Statement; and, secondly, against the course pursued by the noble Lord in not giving either publicly, or, at all events, privately, to those whose business it would have been to defend their Indian Administration, an opportunity of replying to statements which they could not have expected would have been brought forward.

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Mr. E. STANHOPE): The noble Marquess, in the speech which he has just delivered, and in which the admissions were at least as remarkable as the contradictions, has scolded my noble Friend very severely for the course he has thought fit to pursue on this occasion. And the reason is this—that in making his Indian Financial Statement he has attacked the late Government for its Indian finance, and the Marquess of Ripon as their Executive officer. Well, Sir, I am one of those who have always felt that it is exceeding desirable that whenever possible Indian affairs should be kept out of Party controversy. But I should like to ask when right hon. Gentlemen opposite ever spared Lord Lytton or his policy?

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman will allow me to reply to that? I should like to say that we have had plenty of opportunity of attacking Lord Lytton's Government; but I carefully abstained in the first statement I made, when the late Government came into Office, from entering into any controversial subjects.

THE VICE PRESIDENT (Mr. E. STANHOPE): I quite agree with the noble Marquess; he did not on the occasion he refers to make any attack on Lord Lytton, and I can well understand why he did not. It was because there were plenty of us present who were perfectly ready to defend Lord Lytton if any such statement had been made; and I can say with perfect confidence, and in the hearing of the Members of this House, that there was no occasion possible, with the exception of that to which the noble Marquess has referred, when right hon. Gentlemen did not think fit to drag Lord Lytton into a controversy, and to attack him upon everything he had done, whether in his financial administration or in any other part of his government. But I think I may go a good deal further, and I may point out that there is a precedent for the course taken to-night—a precedent of a very remarkable character. I remember very well, if the noble Marquess does not, the debate which we had upon the English Budget in 1883. I remember very well how the Chancellor of the Exchequer, instead of coming down to make the Statement which we ordinarily expect, instead of simply telling us the financial position of this country and the changes he proposed to introduce, devoted half-an-hour of the time of the House to a most elaborate attack upon the financial administration of the preceding Government. I do not think that he gave any Notice that he intended to make that attack. There never was a more bitter and personal attack than that which the late Chancellor of the Exchequer then made, and I cannot for the life of me understand why, for him to make such an attack upon his political opponents was justifiable, and it is so wicked for a Conservative Secretary of State for India to venture to say anything with regard to the financial proposals of his Predecessors. But I might go still further than that, and point out to the Committee that the circumstances were wholly different. My noble Friend has had to take the charge of the financial affairs of India at a time of unparalleled difficulty. He has had left to him a deficit for which he and the Government are not responsible; and, much more, he has had handed over to him a charge which will, he says, remain a charge upon the finances of India for many years to come, possibly for ever. Under these circumstances, it is not at all surprising that he should endeavour to look back and examine the cause of this charge, and endeavour to point out to the House why this accumulation of financial difficulties has arisen, and what had been done by his Predecessors to produce it. My noble Friend put it into one sentence. He said that in spite of every warning the Marquess of Ripon made no provision for meeting that which everybody knew must happen in the process of time. That is the charge. And what answer has been given to-night? We have not heard any answer given either by the noble Marquess or by the hon. Gentleman the late Under Secretary of State for India (Mr. J. K. Cross). They have mentioned no preparations that the Marquess of Ripon made in India for the condition that was undoubtedly coming upon us. They have told us of no preparation that he initiated; they have suggested no policy that he deliberately adopted in the view of what was certain to come. The late Under Secretary, feeling the difficulty of making any statement of that character, resorted to a *tu quoque*. He said—"Well, after all, what did you do?" I might point out that there was an essential difference between the position when we were in Office before and the position of the late Government. I might point out that when we were in Office the advancing Forces of Russia were at that time a long way from the Indian Frontier; but during the last five years they have been creeping on step by step, until now the Russian Frontier is conterminous with that of Afghanistan. Everybody knew that that was coming upon us. Everybody warned you. The Ameer—the person principally concerned—told you over and over again that it was the certain consequence of the Russian advance. And any statesman who was responsible for the safety of India ought, undoubtedly, in the view of the advance that everybody knew was taking place, to have adopted some far-seeing policy based upon a determination to meet the difficulties which were likely to occur, at any rate, within the next few years. We may say for ourselves that we foresaw it. We told the House over and over again during the time of the Government of Lord Beaconsfield what was coming upon us. Well, what did we do? We occupied Quetta amid attacks from the Liberal Party, which I have no doubt are well in the recollection of the Members of this House. We organized the system of Frontier railways, which we believed to be essential to the protection of India. When the noble Marquess speaks of useless and unprofitable enterprizes, I wonder whether he means to refer to that Frontier railway. He told us it was not in the power of the late Government to undo all that Lord Lytton had done. But they did all they could. They abandoned the system of Frontier railways; they allowed a savage tribe to pull up all that they had done of this railway beyond Sibi; they allowed the whole subject to sleep until the force of public opinion, after an interval of three or four years, compelled action to be taken. The noble Marquess speaks of Candahar. It is a remarkable story. I do not know whether the Committee fully realizes how remarkable it is. When the late Government came into Office one of the first steps they took was to order the abandonment of every position we then held on the old Indian Frontier. They began by gradually yielding to the pressure of their advisers. Whatever we may say of the Marquess of Ripon, this, at least, we may say to his credit. He resolutely opposed the policy the late Government adopted. He was altogether opposed to their policy of abandonment. It was entirely due to the pressure put upon the late Government by the Marquess of Ripon and his advisers, that the Government consented to a step they had resolutely opposed, and they said that although they had abandoned Candahar they must hold Pishin. They kept that as quiet as they could. There were many Radical supporters behind them who were opposed to the holding of Pishin, and were anxious that they should retire from a great many other points. ["No, no!"] Well, there were; there can be no doubt of it. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) kept asking the Government when they were going to retire from all their positions. Fortunately for this country they abandoned that policy, and they continued to occupy Pishin. But that unfortunate railway was suspended—as the noble Marquess said to-night, temporarily suspended—and was not again proceeded with until last year, when the pressure put upon the Government made it obvious that the public opinion of this country and of India would compel them to continue the work. Then it has been said that the noble Marques the late Viceroy of India (the Marquess of Ripon) might, at least, if he did not desire to take any other step for the protection of the Indian Frontier, have husbanded the resources of India. He might have endeavoured to practice some economy. The noble Marquess has spoken to-night, in somewhat contemptuous terms, of that demand, and he has referred to what was done with the Native Army. My complaint is this, that, although a Royal Commission on this railway in India had reported that there were many important steps that might be taken for increasing the efficiency of the Army in India and reducing the cost, the only step the late Government thought fit to take was to reduce the Native Army, while every other proposal of that Commission was absolutely rejected. I should like to remind the Committee that I have endeavoured in season and out of season to preach economy in India. Ever since it fell to my lot in 1879 to make a speech announcing the economies which Lord Lytton's Government thought it necessary to effect in India to meet the difficulties then existing, I have been thoroughly convinced not only of the necessity, but also of the possibility, of the reduction of Expenditure in India. In 1883 it was my good fortune to carry a Resolution pledging the House to a reduction of Expenditure in India. The House generally was favourable to the Resolution; but the noble Marquess and hon. Members opposite were hostile to it, and they endeavoured to cut it down and minimize it as much as possible. I regret even at this moment that the late Under Secretary of State for India did not on that occasion during the course of his remarks say a word in support of what I had said I believed to be essential—namely, that the Expenditure must be overhauled. Of course, the late Government were justified in their extraordinary Military Expenditure in preparation for war on our frontier; but I complain that they have not kept down the ordinary Civil Expenditure. I fully admit the services, in the cause of economy, of Lord Northbrook, who took every possible step to keep down Civil Expenditure in India, and his efforts were thoroughly seconded by Lord Lytton and Sir John Strachey; but I complain that ever since Lord Ripon went to India every item of Civil Expenditure has steadily and enormously increased. Might I detain the Committee a few minutes while I put before them a few figures, and I will show the Committee that year after year the Civil expenses have grown to an extent which is most serious for the welfare of India. I will compare the net Expenditure of India in certain items in 1880-1 with what it is now. General Administration has risen by £35,000, Law and Justice by £280,000, Police by £260,000, Education by £260,000, Ecclesiastical Establishments by £12,000, Medical Establishments by £90,000, Political Establishments by £120,000, and the Scientific and other minor Departments by £90,000. I do not think that in the case of any single one of these items the increase can be justified. It appeared to me that the hon. Gentleman the late Under Secretary made a naïve confession just now, for he remarked that owing to certain circumstances on the Frontier of India, the Government thought they might spend rather more money than they did before. Well, Sir, all I can say is it was not the intention of Parliament they should do so. Parliament had voted that early steps should be taken to reduce Expenditure in India; and yet, in spite of the Resolution of this House, they thought they might spend rather more than they did before. I am inclined to think that my noble Friend is justified in the appeal he has made to the new Parliament to deal with Indian finance; and certainly, if I have the honour of a seat in it, I will advocate that the ordinary Expenditure of India shall have the careful attention of the House. I think my noble Friend could not have rendered a greater service to this House than in pointing out the necessity for this reduction, and in endeavouring to impress upon us the great change in the position of India. For my part, I do not desire to say a word which would aggravate or accentuate the difficulties which have existed between this country and Russia; but this, at least, I think may be said without offence and with absolute truth—that the contact of the two countries in Central Asia has revolutionized the finances of India, and altered the whole position we occupy in that country; and we may congratulate ourselves that at this time of crisis we have in the Viceroy an adviser so far-sighted, so courageous, and so prudent as my noble Friend (Lord Dufferin) who now occupies that position.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON wished to make a few remarks upon a point which had been approached that night—namely, the Frontier defences of India. He was afraid that the noble Lord had seemed to encourage the policy of going forward and meeting Russia. He was sorry to hear his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Kincardineshire (Sir George Balfour) speak of the necessity of their occupying Herat for the defence of India.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR said, he had said nothing of the kind; he had never spoken of the occupation of Herat.

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON said, he was glad that he had misunderstood his hon. and gallant Friend. He wished to disabuse the minds of hon. Members of that idea. He had been recently looking at the history of Afghanistan, and found that 50 years ago, in the time of Sir John Malcolm, one of the ablest of Indian Administrators, the Kingdom of Afghanistan did not include Herat; the whole country about Herat belonged at that time to Persia, and the Frontier of Afghanistan was somewhere to the East of Herat. Therefore, to talk of Herat as belonging to Afghanistan and necessary for the defence of India was a great mistake. He should like to get some information from the noble Lord as to the expenditure incurred for the railway in the Pishin Valley, and whether that railway was to be made with a military object—for the formation of a great camp, because if it was to be made with that object, Her Majesty's Government might be sure that it would be taken as a menace to Russia. He pointed out that Russia was waiting till we advanced before she advanced herself. She considered that she had just as much right to advance towards the South as we had towards the North outside our own natural Frontier. It had been pointed out by the Government of Russia, as far back, he believed, as the year 1879, that they objected to our advance into Afghanistan, unless they also advanced in a corresponding manner to the South; and he hoped Her Majesty's Government would consider the advice that had been given them by nearly all the great Indian statesmen who had studied the subject of the defence of India for the last 20 or 30 years, that our proper Frontier was the Suleiman range. That, he said, was our proper Frontier, and the more we depended on it the better, because in proportion as we advanced outside that range our military position was weakened. The noble Marquess the late Secretary of State for War had just now said that their retention of Candahar under the former Conservative Government was a source of weakness, and not a source of strength, and that, therefore, the less they had to do with Candahar, or any part of the Afghanistan territory, the better. ["No, no!"] He (Sir Alexander Gordon) repeated that it was a source of weakness, and he would add, at the same time, that the late Government had shown great courage in abandoning it, in spite of the ridicule of the Conservative Party, for the best military Frontier. There was one more point he wished to refer to before concluding. The noble Lord had referred to arming the Native troops with the Martini-Henry rifle. He thought that such a policy would be a very bad one, because, if an arm discarded in the English Army were given to Native troops, the proceeding would stamp them at once with inferiority as being unfit to use the same weapon as that used by the English troops. [An hon. MEMBER: It is a good arm.] An hon. Member said it was a good arm. That was true; but it had been discarded in the English Army. The English and Native troops were always brigaded together, and if, when the enemy were advancing, they knew that the English regiments had a better weapon to defend themselves with than they were armed with, they could not but feel that they were in a position of disadvantage in the attack. When he was in India the question as to arming the Native troops was raised, and he then gave the opinion that they ought to be armed in the same way as the British troops. He hoped the noble Lord would consider this matter, and not allow the Native troops to have the discarded arms of the European troops. He wished to make one remark about the Frontier of India. It had been pointed out that other countries in Europe had their Frontiers conterminous with the Russian; and he was unable to see why, in Asia, Russia and England should not be conterminous, as Russia and Germany and Russia and Austria were in Europe. It seemed to him that Russia and England must come together in Asia; and he thought that the policy that did not recognize the fact that two civilized countries could be conterminous in one part of the world as well as another was one that would lead them into a great deal of expense and into a great deal of difficulty. He hoped the noble Lord would take into consideration the remarks which he had felt it his duty to make.

MR. CROPPER said, he had a few remarks to make upon three points connected with the Budget now before the Committee; and he could promise hon. Members that he should be very brief in making them. But, before coming to those points, he wished to be allowed to congratulate the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India upon the debate which had taken place. He rejoiced that it had not been again the case that it had taken place in an empty House, and, as was too often the case, at a time when it could not be fully reported in the Press. He was glad, also, that the debate had been of a very interesting character, ; and, perhaps, he might be allowed to thank the noble Lord for the explicit statement on Indian affairs which was made in the Papers laid on the Table of the House—a statement which, he believed, everyone could understand, and which brought before the Committee the whole subject in a very plain and intelligible manner. He had no doubt whatever that what appeared in the newspapers would give the people of England and India a better understanding of the Indian Budget than had been sometimes the case. As he had said, he wished to refer to three points in connection with the Budget. In the first place, the noble Lord had referred to the Salt Tax in India. It had been reduced, he believed, in one part of India by 28 per cent; but he must say that the extreme severity with which the officials of the Revenue Department prevented anything like a breach of the law in obtaining salt had done away with a great part of the advantage to the Natives. He knew that in Madras hundreds of people were taken to the Police Courts, and had to defend themselves for having put a little earth into their water, so that they might be able to drink a little brine. He believed that the noble Lord would earn the thanks of everyone who loved India if he would continue to endeavour to reduce the Salt Tax, in the hope that by so reducing it the trade would be increased, and prove, as had often been proved before, that reduction of duty was not necessarily reduction of income. He believed that the extension of trade which had occurred before would occur again if the noble Lord would venture still further to reduce the duty on salt. Men in England could not understand that salt which was bought for two annas should have a tax of 30 annas upon it. The Salt Tax seemed to be a most unsuitable way of raising Revenue. Then, with regard to the subject of opium. He had taken great interest in the question of the opium trade in China. He had deplored the state of things which had existed since the Chinese War, and he rejoiced that the Chefoo Convention was to be carried out; that China was allowed to see that she was now put upon equal terms with other nations. We had allowed her Ambassadors to draft the terms on which opium should be introduced into China; and, although he thought we should lose more than the amount which the noble Lord stated would be lost on opium, yet he thought we should gain in friendliness with the Chinese, and in the consciences of the English people, who would not feel always condemned when they were taunted by other nations with taking part in an injurious trade which they had forced on the people of China against the will of the Government. He had some reason to believe that the trade in opium with China would diminish. He would not regret it if it did so, and if its place could be taken by other sources of Revenue; hon. Members on that side, at any rate, would rejoice when it disappeared altogether. The trade in opium in China was more developed than it used to be from their own native sources; and he thought the noble Lord might consider that the income from opium would not increase, and that the trade with China would pass away from India and be taken up by Native growers. There was another subject which had been alluded to in former years by the hon. and learned Member for Chatham (Mr. Gorst) and others, and which was looked upon by Indians, and especially referred to by the Indian Press, as a great injustice—that was to say, the prolonged absence of the Court from Calcutta at the Hills. A vast number of officials spent a large portion of their time year after year away from the seat of Government. The hon. and learned Member for Chatham, on many previous occasions, had addressed the House on that subject, and the views he had expressed were fully borne out by English feeling, and also by the newspapers in India. He believed that anyone who could check the growing departure for the Hills, not only of Government officials, but of persons from the Telegraph and Railway Departments, would do a great service to India, by keeping down a source of expenditure and removing discontent from the minds of the Natives. He commended that point, therefore, to the consideration of the noble Lord. He must say that, while he congratulate the noble Lord on the debate that had taken place, he joined with those who had spoken before him in deploring his remarks upon the Marquess of Ripon's administration. He hoped that would be the last time that the debate on the Indian Budget would be made the occasion for Party attack. Indian Natives by thousands had expressed their deep respect and regard for that Nobleman; and he not only expressed his own feeling, but that of others, in saying that the Marquess of Ripon's rule in India had secured them more than any other from the danger, if there was such danger, of invasion from Russia —an invasion which might possibly have secured the sympathy of the people of India had they been under a less popular and less beloved Governnor. He believed that the Marquess of Ripon made their government more beloved in India than any of his Predecessors had done, and he hoped that the aim of his rule would be followed by his Successors.

Sir FREDERICK FITZ-WYGRAM said, the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India had spoken of the probable necessity of increasing the number of European troops in India. For his own part, he believed the number of European troops in India was fully sufficient for ordinary service. But a war with Russia would render it necessary to increase their Forces in India, and it was desirable that the Secretary of State should have those troops exclusively under the command of the Indian Government. If that increase were made, he hoped it would be treated as a Reserve and kept at home, because a British soldier in India cost at least half as much again as he would cost in England, while at the same time he deteriorated in health and vigour by reason of the climate. On the other hand, he increased in health and strength every year he remained in England; and therefore he thought that everyone who wished to see the Indian Establishment maintained at a less cost would desire that this reserve of men should be kept in England. He was aware that in years gone by it took five or six months to send troops to India round the Cape of Good Hope; but those conditions were totally changed, and troops could be shipped now and landed at the furthest Frontier of India in 30 days, and that was an additional reason for keeping them as long as possible at home and not sending them to a hot climate. As he had said, he believed their Force in India was amply sufficient for ordinary purposes; but he had a strong conviction that they did not make all the use they ought of their Native troops. They offered them no military prizes. His own idea was that all officers under those in supreme command should be Natives. There should be a British Officer in supreme command, and he would give him three assistant officers not in command of wings, but as Assistant Commandants. One of these would probably be at home, recruiting his health, thus leaving three officers with the regiment. All under the rank of Commandant or Assistant Commandant should be Natives. He believed it would be found that, under that system, they would have a class of Native officers who would lead the troops in the best manner possible. Moreover, they would be able to maintain the Army at much less cost than at present, and that would enable them to pay their Native soldiers well. Thus, there were two points to which he desired to draw the attention of the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India —namely, the question as to whether the Reserve of the European Army in India should not be be kept at home; and, secondly, whether they ought not to offer the prizes of military ambition to Native gentlemen, and thereby attract to the standard a class of officers ready to lay down their lives in defence of the Empire.

SIR ROBERT FOWLER (LORD MAYOR) said, he had, in the first place, to thank the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India for the statesmanlike speech with which he had introduced the Indian Budget. He should not go into any matters of controversy, though he agreed with all the noble Lord had said, but simply allude to one point introduced by the noble Lord at the conclusion of his speech. The noble Lord said that it was his intention during the next Session of Parliament to move for a Committee on Indian Affairs. Whatever might be the opinion of the present occupants of the Benches opposite, he was sure that that statement would be hailed with the greatest satisfaction. Some years ago he had the satisfaction of seconding a Motion to that effect made in the House of Commons by his honoured Friend the late Mr. Fawcett. The Motion was not accepted by the Government of the day in its entirety; but they gave a Committee in a modified form—they gave him a Committee on the Finances of India, which he believed now bore his name. Mr. Fawcett brought forward the argument, which he was glad to hear repeated by the noble Lord, that under the old Constitution of India, when, at the end of every 20 years, the Charter of the East India Company came to be renewed, a Committee, composed of the most eminent Members of the House of Commons, was appointed to consider the whole question of the administration of India, and everything connected with it. He was very glad that the noble Lord was determined to revive that practice, and he thought the course he had taken with regard to it on that occasion would be attended with the very greatest advantage to the people of India generally. He thought also that it would be very advantageous that the Committee should be appointed at the commencement of the new Parliament. They must bear in mind that the Committee would be composed of some of the most eminent Members of the House, and that it would be almost impossible that they could go fully into this great subject, and reach the end of their investigations, in less than two or three Sessions. He had, together with at least one hon. Gentleman at that moment present, been a Member of Mr. Fawcett's Committee; and he would remind hon. Members that that Committee came to a premature end owing to the dissolution of Parliament. It was therefore obviously important that the Committee should sit at the commencement of the next Session. He trusted the noble Lord would bear that in mind in relation to the step he intended to take; and with regard to which he would say, whether or not the noble Lord continued in the Office which he now adorned, that he believed it would be impossible for anyone to resist the appeal he would make for the appointment of a Committee to inquire into the system of government in India. He should like for a moment to refer to the important subject alluded to by the hon. and gallant Member for South Hants (Sir Frederick Fitz-Wygram). That hon. and gallant Gentleman spoke with great authority on military subjects, and all must feel with him that the question as to the Army in India was one which most vitally affected the interests of the Native population in India. One of the things foreseen in connection with the future of India was that, if they were to avoid the difficulties to which the noble Lord had alluded, it would be necessary to strengthen the Native Army and also the European Army of India. Then there were some important questions bearing on the subject which they were more immediately considering that evening—the Revenues of India. Those Revenues very much depended on three sources. First, there was the Land Revenue, and it seemed to him to be so high already that it could not possibly be raised. He should be glad if the noble Lord, at a future time, found himself in a position to make some reduction in that respect. Next, there was the Opium Revenue, with regard to which he hoped the noble Lord's attention would be directed to the opinions urged upon the Government of India by Sir William Muir, and which would be found in a Minute written when he was Governor of the North-West Provinces. He had not heard that Sir William Muir had at all changed his view, and consequently he might in this matter appeal to the authority of that very eminent and distinguished man—a man who had not only been a Governor of the North-West Provinces, but a Finance Minister of India, and also for many years a Member of the Indian Council in this country. He hoped the noble Lord would give his earnest consideration to the question. Of course, he knew the noble Lord had to be very careful how he treated the finances of India; but he was satisfied that a proposal to get the Revenue derived from opium through some other means would meet with very great favour in this country. There was a strong feeling that by turning themselves into the manufacturers of opium they were placing themselves on a footing with the distillers of alcoholic drinks in this country, and were thereby incurring great responsibility and even culpability. Again, he had a real objection to the Salt Tax, because by it a very heavy impost was placed upon the very poorest of the people. He should be glad if the Government could see their way, if not to repeal the tax entirely, to reduce it considerably. The noble Lord had referred to the Income Tax. He (Sir Robert Fowler) regretted the course which had been adopted in regard to the Income Tax, because it seemed to him that levying a tax upon the incomes of the people was a much more legitimate way of raising Revenue than levying a tax upon such a great necessary of life as salt. He thanked the Committee for permitting him to make these observations, and he thanked the noble Lord for the suggestion—which he hoped the noble Lord would be able to carry out in the next Parliament—that an inquiry should be held into the whole system of government in India. There was one other part of the speech of the noble Lord to which he listened with great satisfaction. The noble Lord referred to the fact that this Parliament was near its close, and he said, in very forcible and eloquent language, that this Parliament had done nothing for the people of India. He (Sir Robert Fowler) supposed that a truer statement was never made in the House of Commons. Whatever views hon. Members or people outside the House might entertain of the present Parliament, it was impossible for anyone to dispute that this Parliament had grossly neglected the interests of the people of India. He joined the noble Lord in most earnestly hoping that the Parliament which would assemble next February would have a much greater desire to do its duty by the people of India than the Parliament which was about to separate had had. He agreed with the late Professor Fawcett that every Member of the House of Commons ought to feel that there was no responsibility which weighed heavier upon him as a Member of Parliament than the responsibility he owed to the people of India.

SIR HARRY VERNEY said, he was very much struck by the large amount of information upon Indian matters which the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) had been able to obtain during the short time he had held his present position. Much had been said that night by the noble Lord on the subject of the Army of India, and he (Sir Harry Verney) would take the liberty to make a suggestion which, if the noble Lord thought well, he might adopt. They did not admit officers to their European Army unless they were well informed in two European languages. Now, they had a great Eastern Empire, and, therefore, their officers ought to have some acquaintance with Oriental languages. He thought it was of the utmost importance that the noble Lord should make it a matter of examination that officers in India should be well acquainted with at least some one Oriental language. It was well known that they could not govern any people properly unless they were able to speak their language. He had no hesitation in saying that had many of their officers spoken Arabic they would have got on better in Egypt and the Soudan. It ought to be a strictly observed rule that no officer should be appointed to an important position in the Indian Staff Corps, or elsewhere, unless he could speak, colloquially, at least, two languages or dialects. To be able to do so ought to give an officer advantage in obtaining an office. If the noble Lord would make it a *sine quâ non* that officers in India should be acquainted with Hindustani and some other Oriental language, he would confer great benefit on the Army and also upon the Natives of India. Moreover, he thought the noble Lord should make it a point to bring to this country some of the best of their Indian soldiers. A few years ago so some of the Indian soldiers who fought gallantly with us elsewhere were brought here, and the experience they gained here was certainly beneficial to them, and calculated to promote our interests in India. It would be wise for the noble Lord to bring over here some of the best men of the Indian Army, send them to Aldershot, and if they proved efficient soldiers obtain for them commissions in their English Army. He very much regretted that on this the first occasion on which the noble Lord had introduced the Indian Budget he had thought it right to make an attack upon the Marquess of Ripon's administration in India. No Viceroy ever did so much for the well-being of India as the Marquess of Ripon, and no Viceroy ever proved so popular with the people of India as that Nobleman. All classes of their Indian fellow-subjects were more attached to them now than they ever were before; and that fact was entirely owing to the Marquess of Ripon having on every occasion done all he could to promote the welfare of the people he was sent out to govern. The Marquess of Ripon made it a rule that whatever could be made by the Natives of India should be made by them; that, in fact, they should have every advantage. English firms who had formerly supplied these things, parties interested in India and in England, also shipowners interested in their carriage, all cried out against Lord Ripon, for he ruled India for the Natives, not for the English; and the consequence was that the Native races were deeply attached to him, and gave him every proof of affection that it was in their power to give. He (Sir Harry Verney) wished the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India every success in the task he had set himself.

MR. ONSLOW said, the right hon. Baronet (Sir Harry Verney), whom they all knew had taken a great interest in Indian affairs for a very long time, had pointed out to the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India the propriety of only appointing and promoting officers in India who had passed through a particular examination. That was exactly the case at the present time. No one could join the Indian Staff Corps unless he had passed certain examinations. There were many officers in India now who had passed the standard in Persian, Arabic, Hindustani, and other Oriental languages, and it was to those men they should have to look in the future. No officer could hope to obtain any advancement in the Indian Army unless he had passed one of those examinations. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Kendal (Mr. Cropper) had referred to the question of the Government of India going to the Hills. He (Mr. Onslow) was one of those who maintained that it was quite right and proper that the Government should go to the Hills in the hot weather. It was all very well formerly for the Government to remain in the plains, when the work of the Viceroy and his Council was comparatively light; but, considering the enormous amount of work which was now entailed on the Viceroy and his Council, it appeared to him (Mr. Onslow) that the Government could not possibly keep their health, or do their work, if they were to remain in the plains during the whole of the year. He was in India when the subject was much discussed; he was for many years connected with the Government of India, and he had been for some years at Simla. The originator of the idea of removing the Government to the Hills in the hot season was Lord Lawrence. As they all knew, Lord Lawrence had been most of his life in the plains of India; but during his Viceroyalty he found the work of government so hard that it was almost impossible to conduct it at Calcutta, and he suggested a migration to Simla. He (Mr. Onslow) was not aware of any miscarriage of government by the removal to Simla in the hot months of the year. He knew that some of the Native papers, and indeed many of the English papers in India, deprecated the idea very much; but his opinion was that the opposition against the Government going to the Hills had been got up chiefly by those connected with the trade of Calcutta and Madras. He held a very strong impression indeed that the government of India could not be conducted now-a-days in a fair and proper way if all the Members of the Government were to remain in the plains. Hon. Members ought not to allow themselves to be deluded by the idea that there was any harm to the Government of India, or to the people of India, by the Viceroy and his Council going up to the Hills. He was perfectly satisfied that the Viceroys could not work anything like as hard as they were required to if they remained in the plains during the whole of the summer months, and he did not know one single instance of any dereliction of duty by the supreme Government on account of this annual migration. His hon. Friend the Lord Mayor (Sir Robert Fowler) had told the Committee that he disapproved of the imposition of the Salt Duty. *Primâ facie* they all deprecated the tax; it was a tax upon the poorest class of the people. But Indian finance was very different to English finance. They could not impart the principles of English finance into Indian finance. In India the money must be raised; and the question was which was the best way to raise it. He thought that, after all, the Salt Duty was felt very little indeed by the people of India. Of course, hon. Gentlemen who had high notions of philanthrophy might say it was a very wrong tax. But if they were to do away with the Salt and Opium Revenue, and to mitigate the Land Tax, as had been suggested, he asked Gentlemen of common sense how would it be possible to get the money to carry on the government of the country? The hon. Baronet (Sir Robert Fowler) preferred an Income Tax to the Salt Tax. He (Mr. Onslow) had had some experience of the Income Tax in India, and it appeared to him it was utterly impossible to have an Income Tax there similar to that in this country, and for the very reason that they could not trust the Indian officials to collect it. When there was an Income Tax in India the Natives, it was well known, tried to assess persons above or below the proper amount; indeed, it was quite clear that in India an Income Tax was a failure. He was amongst those who did not look very hopefully upon the finance of India. A Committee of the House of Commons suggested last year that there should be an increase in the amount paid for the annual construction of railways in India. That was all very good in times of peace; but, so far as India was concerned, the present were not peace times. Russia had advanced to an enormous extent, and it was necessary to protect the frontier. The question was how money should be expended in order that the country might be protected. Everyone was agreed that every 1*d.* that was available ought to be spent in perfecting the defences of the country. The noble Lord the Secretary of State for India had pointed out the necessity of increasing the Army—Native and European. What did that mean? It meant an enormous addition to taxation in India; and how was that addition to be met? Hon. Members might say—"Oh, practice economy." It was all very well to say that. Over and over again he had heard it said—"Let us have economy." He had seen many despatches in which economy was advocated. He had seen Viceroy after Viceroy trying to do all he possibly could to impress upon those with whom he was associated the desirability of practising economy. That was all very right and proper; but, after all, how much could they save by economy? They had now to increase the Native Army and the European Army by some thousands of men; they had to spend an enormous sum of money on fortifications and other defences; and the cost of doing those things would be some millions. Do what they could in India by way of economy, they could only save a few thousands of pounds. It was impossible to meet this increased expenditure by economy in other directions. The Expenditure of India must go on increasing year by year, and it was for the Viceroy to consider how the Expenditure was to be met. He (Mr. Onslow) hoped the noble Lord would not go on year after year, if he continued to hold his present Office—and, judging from the ability with which he had made the Financial Statement, they must all wish he would—borrowing money to meet the Expenditure of India. It was a most vicious system of finance and ought no longer to be practised. Whatever Expenditure it was necessary to incur in India for the ordinary government of the country, India ought to find the Ways and Means. He had had some experience in the House, and as hon. Gentlemen knew, he took a deep interest in everything connected with India. Never, he hoped, would he say one word in a Party way regarding the management of Indian finance, or regarding India generally. Whatever his views might be of the late Viceroyalty of India, he did not want to say publicly one word against the Marquess of Ripon. But he wished to remind hon. Gentlemen opposite what they had said about Lord Lytton. What deprecation was not levelled at Lord Lytton for the way in which he conducted the government of India? Bearing in mind the course hon. Gentlemen took in regard to Lord Lytton, he was surprised they should say, *à propos* of some strong remarks that had been made about the Marquess of Ripon, that this was the first time in which Party spirit had entered into their discussion respecting the conduct of the Viceroy of India. [Sir Henry James: On the Indian Budget.] He did not see that it mattered whether it was on the Budget or on any other matter connected with the policy of the government of India. He asserted that no words were too strong for hon. Gentlemen opposite to use against Lord Lytton's Viceroyalty; therefore it was rather hard for them to come forward now and say this was the first time strong words had been used in the House of Commons concerning an Indian Viceroyalty. Well, the noble Lord the Secretary of State for India had alluded to a Committee he hoped to appoint next year to inquire into the system of government in India. He (Mr. Onslow) believed that an inquiry would be very useful indeed; at the present time it was greatly required. It must be borne in mind that the Act for the better government of India was passed in 1858, somewhat in a panic. The days of 1858 were, he hoped, past and gone, and that they would not hear again of an Indian Mutiny. That Act was passed under many adverse circumstances, and it appeared to him that it now required revision. It might be a matter of doubt whether the Act should be revised, and whether the whole system of government in India should be inquired into by a Committee or by a Royal Commission. For his part, he thought the inquiry ought to be made by a Royal Commission empowered to take evidence in India. At the same time, he was quite convinced that an inquiry by a strong Committee of the House would be extremely useful. He trusted that, whatever was done, hon. Members of the future would not cease to take the deepest interest in the affairs of India, because, unless the House of

Commons did take an interest in India, and thoroughly sifted for themselves everything connected with the government of that country, he was afraid that that government might devolve upon a few, and all Parliamentary control lapse. In his opinion, it would be a very bad day for India if such a state of things came to pass.

Mr. BUCHANAN said, that considering the late hour (11.0), and the fact that the noble Lord (Lord Randolph Churchill) had by his extraordinary speech taken away from the House the opportunity of quietly and peaceably debating Indian subjects, he should make his remarks very brief. He, like many others, came down to the House to listen to, and possibly to join in, a discussion on Indian affairs and Indian financial questions. He admired, as others must have done, the ability with which the noble Lord described the financial position of India; but he deplored more than he could express the turn—and he desired as a private Member of the House to protest as strongly as he could against it—which the noble Lord gave to his speech, converting the Indian Financial Statement of the year into a Party election speech. In the peroration of his speech the noble Lord called Heaven to witness that he hoped that in the new Parliament more attention would be given in that House to the affairs of India. If the noble Lord's was the sort of attention the affairs of India were to get the less attention they got the better. Amongst the comments upon the noble Lord's accession to Office he observed an extract from a Native Indian newspaper, in which some of the noble Lord's characteristics were described. *The Indian Echo* wrote of the noble Lord—

> "His bellicosity is notorious, he is an out and out fire-eater, and he does not believe in peace."

He (Mr. Buchanan) thought that the extraordinary speech they had that night heard from the noble Lord fully justified the sentiments which that Native newspaper expressed. The noble Lord had, no doubt, displayed considerable energy in everything he undertook, and it would have been well if he had devoted his energy in his Office to securing reforms for the better administration of India. He thought that, by his conduct to-night, the noble Lord belied the force of his own words in his speech at the Tower Hamlets, when he stated that the Government of India ought never to be made a Party question in that House. It was quite impossible, after the speech the noble Lord had delivered, for Indian subjects to remain other than Party questions so long as the noble Lord remained in his present Office. What had the noble Lord done? Why, he had taken advantage of an opportunity which presented itself to him as Secretary of State to make an unprovoked, an unwarranted, and an uncalled-for attack upon the Marquess of Ripon and the late Government. He had, in fact, turned his Ministerial Statement on the finances of India into an election address. What was it the noble Lord accused the Marquess of Ripon of doing? He (Mr. Buchanan) had taken down the noble Lord's very words. In a kind of parody of the poet Swinburne, the noble Lord had stated that the Marquess of Ripon had been "lulled by the langour of the lotus land," and that no economy had ever been practised by him during all the years of his administration. Well, an answer to that charge had already been made by hon. and right hon. Gentlemen who had spoken before him (Mr. Buchanan) from the Liberal Benches. But if he wanted to give a further answer to the charge, they had it here in the statement the noble Lord had circulated and the speech he himself had made that night. He gave them in this statement, and he had declared to them that night, that the average surplus during the last three years had been £660,000, and that the Marquess of Ripon's Government had expended on the Famine Insurance Fund the sum of £1,500,000 during the last three years. The Marquess of Ripon, then, had spent £1,500,000 on Famine Insurance, and, besides, had had an aver age annual surplus of £660,000. That was the test of the Marquess of Ripon's economy; whereas they might take as a test of the extravagance of the noble Lord's Government, that he was going to swallow up that surplus, to suspend payments to the Famine Insurance Fund, and going to add millions to the burdens of India. The noble Lord had charged the Marquess of Ripon with having spent the money on productive works, instead of on frontier railways and other projects for military defence; but he (Mr. Buchanan) would put it to the Committee whether it was not more for the permanent welfare of India and its inhabitants to spend money in developing the country, on roads and public works, which would tend to the ultimate prosperity and wealth of the country, rather than to waste it on useless military works and railways for military purposes. Then the noble Lord had accused the noble Marquess of having lowered the Salt Duty and reduced the Native Army. Well, the answer to that had been suggested by the noble Lord himself, because, after having accused the Marquess of Ripon of having lowered the Salt Duty, he had, in a subsequent part of the same speech, thanked him for having done the same thing; and he (Mr. Buchanan) was bound to say that it was to the credit of the Marquess of Ripon, and it would be to the credit of the noble Lord himself, if during his administration he could do anything to reduce the taxation which pressed so heavily on the poorest classes in India. Then the noble Lord had attacked the Marquess of Ripon for admitting the Natives to a certain degree of political power, and had found fault with him for having advanced education and freed the Press; and it had been a matter of great astonishment to him (Mr. Buchanan) when he had heard the Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) justifying the noble Lord's accusation against the Marquess of Ripon. It was an astonishing thing that the right hon. Gentleman—himself a Minister of Education in that House—should think it a matter of reproach to the Marquess of Ripon that he had, during his Viceroyalty, largely increased the expenditure on education in India. He (Mr. Buchanan) knew, of course, that the noble Lord had no liking for the development of a free Press in India. He knew he had no liking for the growth of political influence among the Natives of India, because he had himself denounced those two kinds of development of recent years in India as two of the greatest dangers to their Empire.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL): The hon. Gentleman is entirely incorrect. I disclaim ever having made any statement to justify that observation.

MR. BUCHANAN: I have the noble Lord's speech with me.

An HON. MEMBER: Read it.

MR. BUCHANAN: It would be out of Order to read it; the speech was delivered on the 4th of May of the present year. It was a speech in which the noble Lord gave the results of his Indian tour. He said that, though it might be premature in him to express any opinion as to the results of his Indian experiences, still there were four things that he thought it was necessary and right that he should bring before his audience as dangers to the stability of our rule; and of those four things two were the discontent in the Indian Army of a most serious kind and the grievances, some of which he said were well founded, between the Indian Princes and the Calcutta Government.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL): What are you quoting from?

MR. BUCHANAN: From *The Times* newspaper of the 5th of May. The noble Lord said that there was discontent of the most serious kind in the Indian Army.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman will not be in Order in quoting a speech made this Session.

MR. BUCHANAN said, that he should pass the Report to which he referred over to the noble Lord, if he desired to look at it. At any rate, the noble Lord had given those four points as, in his opinion, salient features of the condition of things in India, the consideration of which had been forced upon him during his tour in that country. The four points were—discontent in the Native Army; grievances which were found to exist between Native Princes and the Calcutta Government; the great development and free comments of the Native Press; and the growth of political intelligence among the Natives. The noble Lord had summed up by saying that those four elements were among the dangers to which our rule was exposed in India. He (Mr. Buchanan) thought he could refresh the memory of some Members of the Committee, without quoting the noble Lord's speech, simply by informing them that it was the speech in which the noble Lord denounced the probable conclusion of peace by the late Government with Russia as "terrible news." ["No, no!"] Yes; the noble Lord had denounced the action of the late Government in that respect in these words, and he had denounced it, too, in the same speech as "a base and cowardly surrender." Well, if he (Mr. Buchanan) might be allowed for once to stoop to use the language of the noble Lord he should say that his speech that night was a base and cowardly attack upon the Marquess of Ripon.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Gentleman is not entitled to use language of that kind.

MR. BUCHANAN: If in quoting the language of the noble Lord I find myself using un-Parliamentary phrases I withdraw.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Gentleman repeats such language I shall insist upon his resuming his seat.

MR. BUCHANAN said, he withdrew the expression. He would only quote one other statement of the noble Lord, and that he was entitled to quote, as the noble Lord had made it that night. He had summed up his attack upon the Marquess of Ripon by saying that he disowned and repudiated the policy of the late Viceroy. Those were the identical words the noble Lord used the other night in regard to Earl Spencer—he had disowned and repudiated his policy. So they found that one of the leading principles of Conservative policy at that moment was ingratitude in disowning public servants who had discharged their public duty faithfully according to the commissions which had been given to them. The noble Lord in the course of his speech—and he (Mr. Buchanan) hardly thought it worth while to detain the Committee, however, by going into it at that hour—had gone on to propose, at the end of his speech, that they should have a Commission of Inquiry into the condition of the Government of India. But the noble Lord forebore to tell them what the scope of that inquiry was to be. He should like to ask the noble Lord whether part of the scope of that inquiry was to be an examination into, and arraignment of, the Marquess of Ripon's Native policy. He was sure the noble Lord did not wish to examine into that; but if he did, he would put it to him that as he himself had been in India since that policy was begun he must know very well that, in the first place, it had been successful, and that, in the second place, it had won the enthusiastic approval of all the people of India. ["No, no!"] Yes; he maintained that that was the case, and, in the third place, it was the only just and prudent policy which this country could pursue. And more than that, if the noble Lord attempted, or wished to attempt, by this Commission or Committee which he was going to appoint, to arraign the policy of the Marquess of Ripon towards the Natives, he would be really arraigning the policy of the Queen's Proclamation of 1859, on which all the liberties of Her Majesty's Native subjects depended. He had felt extremely astonished when he had heard the noble Lord say that he had the full consent of his Colleagues in the appointment of this Committee or Commission. He had felt particularly astonished to hear that he had the assent of the right hon. Member for Mid Lincolnshire (Mr. E. Stanhope). That right hon. Gentleman was Under Secretary for India at the time when a Motion was brought forward towards the close of the last Parliament on this subject by the late Mr. Fawcett, in the spring of 1879. The Motion was opposed by the Government then, and all hon. Members on the Front Ministerial Bench had voted against it, the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) included; and therefore it appeared that the noble Lord had succeeded in turning over all his Colleagues to his own view on this subject to such an extent that they were now prepared to adopt a policy which a few years ago they condemned. The noble Lord had stated—and so far as he (Mr. Buchanan) remembered he had stated it in public before—that the justification for inaugurating a Committee of Inquiry into the affairs of India was that the Indian was a despotic Government, and that it would be better to have the free air of an inquiry in the House of Commons upon it. The Government of India no doubt was a despotism; but it was a despotism defined and restricted by law, and he thought that a control over the affairs of the Natives such as they exercised in India was not likely to be beneficially modified and improved by inquiries from time to time by Parliament or some political authority. He thought they should rather take care that their despotism and their Government in India was strictly guarded in its execution by definite, well-considered, and prudent laws, and that they also ought to take care that those who were charged with the administration of that system were carefully chosen and selected, and had to look for the success of their career to the prosperity and welfare of the people committed to their charge. Of course, they all knew perfectly well that complaints had often been made against the Government of India; the noble Lord had in other places told them something about those complaints. The noble Lord had told them that the Government of India was an enormous legislative machine; that it had too great rigidity, and a want of sympathy with the people of India; and in a great measure, undoubtedly, that was the case. But it seemed to him that if they were to endeavour in any way to remedy that state of things—he did not say they could wholly do so, because he believed that some rigidity and want of sympathy was indispensable to anything like the government they now exercised over India — but if they were to attempt to remedy it, he believed it would be much better for them to do it by careful legislation for India, and by careful administration there than by setting up in the House of Commons Committees or Commissions to inquire into a great variety of subjects. There was just one word more he should like to say upon this subject. There was, no doubt, a tendency in a Government such as that of India, composed, as Lord Lytton had estimated it, of 1,000,000 officials—there was, no doubt, a tendency among so many officials of lower grade to exercise petty tyranny over those who were subjected to them, and no doubt it was difficult to have perfect articulation to the extremities of such an elaborate machine. But he did not see how a House of Commons' Committee or a Commission could remedy a grievance of that kind. If the Committee was, as he suspected it would be, a Committee of the House of Commons, it would have to sit in this country, and in such an event it would be useless for the purpose the noble Lord appointed it. If, on the other hand, the noble Lord proposed sending out a Commission, it seemed to him that that work would be practically interminable. There was one direction in which he should have thought that the noble Lord might have exercised his energies before proceeding to appoint another Commission. He should have thought the noble Lord might have devoted his attention to the work of seeing that the recommendations of Committees and Commissions already appointed were carried out. For instance, there had been a Committee which had sat on Indian finance for a number of years, there had been a Committee on Public Works, there had been a Commission such as that the noble Lord had wanted to institute—namely, a Famine Commission, which had inquired into the social and economical condition of India. The recommendations of the Finance Committee had not been carried out, and far from all of those of the Famine Commission had been carried out. And then there had been another of those Commissions, the recommendations of which were now lying still-born in the India Office—namely, the Simla Army Commission, which had been alluded to that night. The noble Lord had spoken of economy in regard to the Indian Army; but he (Mr. Buchanan) would point out that the Simla Army Commission did not merely recommend the reduction of the Forces of India, but several reforms which would tend to economy and efficiency. Those recommendations, however, had never been carried out. He could have enlarged further upon those points had it not been for the cause he had already referred to, and just before sitting down he would repeat once more his deep regret at what had taken place that night, and his belief that very disastrous consequences would ensue from the present conduct of Indian affairs in that House.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Lord Randolph Churchill), in reply, said, he hoped that when the defence of the Marquess of Ripon's policy in India, which they had that night been given to understand would shortly be forthcoming, was attempted, it would be undertaken in a more coherent and more impressive manner than that which had been exhibited by the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down. A greater farrago of inaccurate assertion, inaccurate quotations, and inaccurate representations of other people's opinions than that in the hon. Member's speech, it had never been his misfortune to hear; and, for his part, he entirely declined to take up the time of the House of Commons, at that late hour of the evening, in attempting what he knew beforehand would be the utterly impossible task of making the hon. Gentleman understand the real opinions which he (Lord Randolph Churchill) had expressed, and the facts concerning Indian affairs which he had placed before the Committee. Turning from the observations of the hon. Member to the remarks of other hon. Members who, differing from the hon. Member for Edinburgh, had confined their remarks to the question before the Committee, he would express to them his sincere acknowledgments for the manner in which they had received the Statement he had been allowed to make. He could assure them, whether as regarded their criticisms of those parts of his Statement with which they disagreed, or their suggestions of what they would wish to see carried out in India or embodied in Indian policy, that they should have his most earnest attention. He could assure those hon. Members that he received their criticisms and suggestions in a most respectful manner. Before allowing the debate to come to a close, he would wish to make one remark in answer to the observations which had fallen from the noble Marquess the late Secretary of State for India (the Marquess of Hartington). The noble Marquess had charged him with having adopted an unusual course in making a Party attack upon the late Viceroy of India on the Indian Budget. That was, to some extent, a misrepresentation of the course he had pursued. No doubt, he had adopted an unusual course in criticizing as he had done the policy of the late Government; but the Committee must remember that he had to deal with unusual times. It was absolutely necessary, in dealing with unusual times, that he should to some extent depart from the usual course which had been adopted on former occasions; and nothing could show that more clearly than the speech which had fallen from the hon. Member who had just sat down. It was absolutely necessary that he should show the Committee and the public who were the authors of the heavy expenditure and the heavy deficit he had referred to, and which they had to meet. He thought it was most fortunate that he had been able to do that, because they had had an admirable specimen of the line adopted by Radical Members in the accusation made against him by the hon. Member for Edinburgh of being responsible for a deficit of £15,000,000 in the Indian Revenue, and for adding to the Indian Army an additional expenditure of £2,000,000 a-year. It was in order to free the present Government from such charges that he knew would be recklessly and widely made that he had deliberately adopted the course he did. He once warned the Party opposite that the doctrine of legacy might be used with fatal effects against themselves. Nothing was hurled over and over again more virulently against the Tory Party than the charge that all the difficulties and perplexities that the late Government had had to encounter, and which compassed them about, were a legacy from their Predecessors. As far as the present Government was concerned with regard to India, he had been determined that on this question it should be impossible for hon. Members to say that the present financial imbroglio was not a legacy from the late Tories to the Liberals, for, as a matter of fact, it was exactly the reverse. There was only one other point in the speech of the noble Marquess on which he would attempt to make any remark. The noble Marquess had complained that he had given him no notice of the remarks that he intended to make. He was not aware that when a Minister was going to make his Statement—his annual Statement—in the House of Commons, it was in accordance with precedents that he should give his opponents, or anybody else, notice of the exact line of observation he intended to pursue. He had never heard of such a course being adopted. The noble Marquess must know the circumstances of Indian finance, and he must have known, before he left Office, that those circumstances were of so peculiar a kind that they would attract the most direct, and probably severe criticism possible—the severe criticism of anyone who commented upon them from an opponent's point of view. The noble Marquess said he was not prepared for such an attack. The noble Marquess had only shown in his conduct of the debate that night the extraordinary amount of unpreparedness which was one of the main features of the policy of the late Government. He could not understand how anyone, knowing the character of the finances of India for the year, could suppose it would be possible for him to explain that financial position to the House of Commons without going on to explain what he considered to be the cause of that financial position. On examination he did not think that the noble Marquess would persist in his charge against him of having been guilty of a breach of House of Commons' decorum in taking the course he had done. He did not think the charge that he had acted unusually and indecorously would, on examination, be found a serious charge. With regard to the financial policy of the Marquess of Ripon he did not wish to enter into it again, but would only say that, if it were so successful and so admirable a policy, how was it it happened that in 1884-5 the Revised Estimates showed a deficit of £710,000? How was it that since the days of the Earl of Mayo no single year's account showed a deficit of Indian finance except deficits attributable either to war or famine, while the Marquess of Ripon, after being Viceroy of India for four years, during which time there was no war and no famine to deal with, enjoyed the proud distinction of being the first Viceroy who had produced a most remarkable deficit which he was totally unable to attribute to any other cause except his own financial policy? He would leave that point to be dealt with by the Marquess of Ripon and his friends when they made their defence. At that hour of the night, and knowing that there was much important Business to occupy the attention of the House, he would not trouble the Committee further, but would thank them, generally, for the manner in which they had allowed him to make his Statement, and for the generous way in which they had commented upon it.

Question put, and *agreed to*.

Resolved, That it appears, by the Accounts laid before this House, that the Total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1884 was £71,727,421, including £13,240,507 received from Productive Public Works; that the Total Expenditure in India and in England was £70,339,925, including £12,032,754 spent on Productive Public Works (Revenue Account); that there was an excess of Revenue over Expenditure in that year of £1,387,496; and that the Capital Expenditure on Productive Public Works in the same year was £3,992,029, including a Charge of £566,261 incurred in the redemption of previously existing liabilities.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow*.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL

[*Lords*].—[BILL 257.]

(*Secretary Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered*.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) moved, after Clause 7, to insert the following Clause:—

(Unlawful detention with intent to have carnal knowledge.)

"Any person who detains any woman or girl against her will—

(1) In or upon any premises with intent that she may be unlawfully and carnally known by any man, whether any particular man or generally, or

(2) In any brothel,

shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and, being convicted thereof, shall be liable at the discretion of the court to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour.

"Where a woman or girl is in or upon any premises, or in any brothel, a person shall be deemed to detain such woman or girl in or upon such premises or in such brothel if with intent to compel or induce her to remain in or upon such premises or in such brothel, such person withholds from such woman or girl any wearing apparel or other property belonging to her, or where wearing apparel has been lent or otherwise supplied to such woman or girl by or by the direction of such person, threatens such woman or girl with legal proceedings if she takes away with her the wearing apparel so lent or supplied.

"Legal proceedings shall not be taken against any such woman or girl for taking away or being found in possession of any such wearing apparel as was necessary to enable her to leave such premises or brothel."

New Clause *brought up*, and read the first and second time."

MR. WARTON begged to move an Amendment to the clause to insert after the word "premises," in line 9, the words "for the purpose of having any unlawful carnal connection." He pointed out that as the clause was drawn it was possible that a private master or mistress might be brought within its scope. Nothing could be wider than the words "any premises." He was quite sure that, however rigorously and harshly a master or mistress might behave in regard to a servant, they would not wish to bring them in guilty as they would the keepers of brothels.

Amendment proposed,

In line 9, after the word "premises," to insert the words "for the purpose of having any unlawful carnal connection."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) thought, with the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton), that some other words might be introduced here. As the clause was now drawn, it might be taken to mean other premises than a brothel. He thought it was better that the words suggested by the hon. and learned Member should be put in.

MR. SERJEANT SIMON asked whether this matter was not controlled by the 1st sub-section of the clause, which said—

> "Any person who detains any woman or girl against her will in or upon any premises with intent that she may be unlawfully and carnally known by any man, whether any particular man or generally."

MR. WARTON: No.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD said, he preferred the simpler plan of adding the words "as aforesaid."

MR. STANSFELD thought that the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General on reflection would not be able to accept these words.

MR. STAVELEY HILL said, what the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. Stansfeld) said was quite right; but the whole clause was such nonsense that the more nonsensical it was made the better. The Government did not seem to know at all what they were going to do with the Bill.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): I beg your pardon.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, that if the hon. and learned Member would agree to accept these words—

> "Any person who detains any woman or girl against her will for the purposes herein mentioned," &c.

he thought he might accept them.

MR. WARTON was not prepared to withdraw his own Amendment.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he would appeal to the hon. and learned Member to accept his words.

SIR FARRER HERSCHELL pointed out that the Amendment would defeat its own end, for in the second part of the paragraph they would simply be re-enacting the first paragraph of the clause. He thought the being in or upon the premises was to be *primâ facie* evidence.

MR. WARTON: I must insist upon my Amendment.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 81; Noes 59: Majority 22.—(Div. List, No. 273.)

On Motion of Mr. WARTON, the following Amendment made:—Line 9, after "or," insert "is."

MR. WARTON moved, in line 15, after "such person," to insert "such person." The reason he desired the Amendment was because there was such a very large interval between the expression and the definition of "such person."

Amendment proposed, in line 15, after "such person," to insert "such person."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That 'such person' be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): It is so absolutely immaterial.

Amendment *agreed to.*

MR. WARTON moved, in line 18, to insert the word "No" at the beginning of the paragraph. His object was to strike out the word "not" later on, so as to make the paragraph read "no legal proceedings shall be taken," &c., instead of "legal proceedings shall not be taken."

Amendment proposed, in line 18, place "No" at the beginning of the line.—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'No' be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) had no objection to the Amendment; but he preferred the words "shall not."

MR. WARTON did not quite understand. He desired to know what the right hon. Gentleman proposed before he gave up his position?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he agreed to the sense of the Amendment, but not to the actual words.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT thought the hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) was right, as the clause would be bad grammar otherwise.

MR. STAVELEY HILL suggested that it really was desirable to put a little common sense in an Act of Parliament.

Amendment *agreed to.*

On Motion of Mr. WARTON, the following Amendment made:—Line 18, leave out "not."

MR. STAVELEY HILL proposed an Amendment, in line 19, to leave out the word "such" in order to insert the word "necessary," so that the words should run, "being found in possession of any necessary wearing apparel," instead of "such wearing apparel as was necessary to enable her to leave such premises or brothel." The clause, as it stood, seemed to him to be an amplification of words without giving any meaning.

Amendment proposed, in line 19, by leaving out the word "such," and inserting the word "necessary,"—(*Mr. Staveley Hill,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the word 'such' stand part of the Bill."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) desired to point out to the hon. and learned Member that the words in line 20 which he proposed to leave out were intended to prevent the girl taking away anything which was not absolutely necessary. If they said "necessary wearing apparel" it would leave the girl a discretion to take away whatever she might think was necessary.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, be added to the Bill."

MR. MORGAN LLOYD pointed out that with the Amendment which had been added the clause in line 9 recited—

> "Where any woman or girl is in or upon any premises for the purpose of having any unlawful carnal connection."

There might be many cases in which the girl was not there for the actual purpose, although efforts were being made to induce her to have carnal connection.

MR. SPEAKER said, they had gone through the clause now. It was, therefore, too late to make any further Amendment on the clause.

MR. MORGAN LLOYD did not propose to make any alteration in those words; but he wanted to call the attention of the Attorney General to the matter, and to ask him whether he would not make some addition to the clause at the end?

MR. SPEAKER said, it was impossible to make any Amendment now. The Question was whether the clause, as amended, should stand part of the Bill.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

MR. SAMUEL SMITH said, he had given Notice of the following new clause:—

> (Evidence of girl against whom the offence is committed shall be admissible in evidence.)
>
> "When a girl, in respect of an offence against whom a charge is brought under this Clause, is, in the opinion of the court justices or magistrates, too young to understand the nature of an oath, such girl shall be competent to give evidence without oath: Provided, That no person shall be liable to be convicted of the offence unless the testimony of such girl, implicating the accused, shall be corroborated by some other material evidence in support thereof. And the court may, for the same purpose, allow a similar statement made by her before the committing justice or magistrate, and taken down in writing at the time, to be used for the same purpose at the trial.

The House would see that the clause was divided into two parts, the later part being contained in the last three lines, which allowed a statement made by the girl before the committing justice or magistrate to be used as evidence at the trial. With regard to the major portion of the clause, he found that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Attorney General (Sir Henry James) had a similar proposal to make later on; and therefore he was agreeable to withdraw the first part in favour of that of the right hon. and learned Gentleman. He would then ask to add the last three lines of his clause to the end of the right hon. and learned Gentleman's clause.

MR. SPEAKER pointed out that the proper course would be for the hon. Member to withdraw his clause, and then to bring up his words as an Amendment to the later clause.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH then asked leave to withdraw his clause.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. STAVELEY HILL begged to move the following clause:—

> "Upon the conviction of any prisoner under sub-section one of section five, the judge shall inquire of the jury whether they find that the act of which the prisoner has been convicted was done with the consent of the girl, and, if the jury shall find that she did so consent, the judge shall order her to be sent to a reformatory school for a period not exceeding two years."

He ventured to call the attention of the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt) to this matter in reference to what he had said the other night. The right hon. Gentleman had suggested that it would be a very unfortunate thing indeed if they proceeded to fill their gaols with boys and with men against whom there could be no real offence charged. Now, let them consider what they were doing. What they were doing was this. When a lad of 15 or 16 was having connection with a girl under 15, with full consent, in any place where they might be found by a policeman, he might be dragged off to gaol at once. He would put it to the House was it, or was it not, a wrong thing that was being done by the persons guilty of that at which the Bill was aimed; and was it, or was it not, intended that they should be punished? What was the punishment for? Was it because an offence was committed, or merely because the girl was under the age of 16 at the time it was committed? What was the real state of the case? In this country a girl was supposed to have reached the age of puberty when she was between 12 and 13. There was no period in a girl's life, especially where she had not been properly brought up, or cared for by her parents and guardians, at which she was more likely to be led astray than when between the ages of 15 and 16 years. He thought that in that statement he should carry the concurrence of any person who had studied the question. Well, that being so, what was it the House was doing? They were saying, as the Bill stood at present, that where a girl was in this condition, and induced a boy or a young man to commit an offence, the boy was to be punished and the girl was to go scot free, not only with regard to punishment for her share in the offence, but in regard, also, to any education she might obtain in a reformatory to which she might be sent for the purpose of improving her mind and teaching her better habits. Now, he asked the House, was that fair? Let them consider the question for a moment. Let them take the case of two children—a boy and girl, both under the age of 16. Those two young persons might be found by a policeman committing an offence under this Bill, and in the result the boy was to be the only party punished. He did not know whether the boy would be flogged or not; but he would be imprisoned, and, under certain circumstances, he would be liable also to undergo a flogging. It might happen that a few yards further on the policeman might come upon two persons—a man and a woman, of the age of 25, committing the same offence. The question naturally arose, was that wrong on the part of the two who were under 16 which was right in the case of those of 25; and was it intended to reverse the principle of the law, and say they would punish the younger offenders and excuse the elder ones? If that were so, on what principle was the boy to be punished and the girl to be allowed to go scot free? He submitted that the House ought to adopt the words he had inserted in his clause; and, if it would allow him, he would read them, as they were very brief. They were as follows:—

> "Upon the conviction of any prisoner under sub-section one of section five, the Judge shall inquire of the jury whether they find that the act of which the prisoner has been convicted was done with the consent of the girl, and, if the jury shall find that she did so consent, the Judge thall order her to be sent to a reformatory school for a period not exceeding two years."

What, he asked, would be the result of adopting this clause? They would find that cases would not be so likely to be trumped up, and where a girl under the age of 16 had tempted a boy to the commission of an offence she would not bring a charge against him. They would not have such cases as had been alluded to by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt); but due caution would be exercised. He (Mr. Staveley Hill) entreated the House, if they would do justice between the two sexes and prevent charges under this Bill being used as a means of extortion by policemen and girls against boys in a better or worse position, not to omit to punish the girl as well as the boy; but, where a charge of this sort was made, to allow the Judge, when he thought he could fairly do so, to put it to the jury whether the girl was a consenting party, and if the jury found that she was, then to give the Judge the power to afford her the opportunity of a proper mode of reformation by sending her to a reformatory for a period of two years.

New Clause (Girl to be sent to reformatory if act was committed with her consent,)—(*Mr. Staveley Hill,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): I fully appreciate the motives that have induced my hon. and learned Friend to bring forward this clause, as there is no one in this House who has a stronger desire than myself to prevent anything in regard to legislation of this kind that would afford the slightest facilities for extortion. At the same time, I cannot consent to the insertion of this clause. I would ask the hon. and learned Gentleman who has moved it this question—What crime has the girl committed? because we could not confine a girl in a reformatory, as he proposes, for a period of two years, unless she has committed some crime. A reformatory school is essentially a criminal institution, and you could not send a girl to such a place unless you can show that she is a criminal.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he did not wish to follow the argument of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary at any length; but he would reply to it very briefly. The right hon. Gentleman had intimated that the girl could not be considered guilty of any offence. Now, he (Mr. Hopwood) asserted that she had committed an offence.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): I said "crime."

MR. HOPWOOD said, he would adopt the word mentioned by the right hon. Gentleman, and would say that the girl had committed a crime. The Bill made the act done a crime on the part of the man, and it was quite clear that he could not commit the crime without the girl. The girl was held to be bound to know the law, and, therefore, the act being a crime on the part of the man, she was accessory to that crime. He would make bold to say that they might have some very nice questions raised on this point with regard to the girl's being an accomplice, whose evidence could not be received without considerable suspicion; and he only hoped the House would find that they had landed themselves in some of these complications by attempting to make that a crime which Nature never meant to be so interpreted. He could not say that the clause, as it stood, was altogether what he should have made it if he had had the drawing of it, because he saw some difficulty in the way in which it might operate. There were many hon. Gentlemen near him who felt that the law should be made the same for both sexes. What they contended was this—that cases, as his learned Friends would admit, constantly occurred in which girls under 16 were a hundred times more culpable than the youths whom, in reality, they seduced—cases where the girls were more advanced and matured, both in body and mind; and yet, as the Bill stood, the act done was to be a crime on the part of the boy, and none at all on the part of the girl. That appeared to him so utterly preposterous that he could not understand how the House could possibly legislate in such a direction. He put it to those who were responsible for the measure, how could they defend so monstrous a proposition? If the hon. and learned Gentleman who had moved this clause went to a division he (Mr. Hopwood) should vote for it.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he thought there was a very simple answer to the argument of his hon. and learned Friend opposite (Mr. Staveley Hill). The assumption of the Bill was that a girl under 16 could never be a consenting party; that a girl of that age would be in exactly the same position as a girl under 13 was placed in by the existing law. Therefore, the arguments employed by his hon. Friends who supported the clause applied equally to the state of things under the present law. Whether it was right or wrong to raise the age to 16 was a question that had already been determined by the House. As the Bill now stood, the age of consent had been raised from 13 to 16, and the assumption was that a girl was not to be considered capable of giving consent until she was 16. His right hon. Friend the Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld) and his hon. Friend the Member for Hackney (Mr. Stuart) would seem to place those under 16 on an equality, in this respect, with those above that age.

Mr. GREGORY did not think the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) would have made some of the observations he had addressed to the House on this subject if he had had the experience which had fallen to his (Mr. Gregory's) lot in regard to the description of crime with which it was proposed to deal. In numerous cases that were brought to his knowledge the girls were the daughters of very respectable persons, and had been sent to service at a very early age, whereby they were often exposed to all sorts of temptations, such, for instance, as they were subjected to in public-houses or lodging houses. Those girls required every protection, and he did not think it would be right, in cases where they might have yielded to temptation, to send them to reformatories, and thus to stigmatize them as criminals before the world. He certainly protested against any such proposal.

Mr. STANSFELD said, he rose to protest against the interpretation put by his right hon. Friend the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) on the position taken by his hon. Friend the Member for Hackney (Mr. Stuart) and himself. They believed in the equality of men and women; but they had never believed in the equality of children with them. The existing law was, as the right hon. Gentleman had said, for the protection of female children below the age at which they had hitherto been supposed capable of giving consent; and they knew that under the age given in this Bill they were not capable of giving consent. Therefore, they were not on an equality with men and women.

Mr. J. G. TALBOT thought it would be desirable to alter the framing of the clause under discussion by substituting for the words "reformatory school" the words "industrial school," and that, instead of the matter being left to the jury, it should be left at the discretion of the Judge to take the action required. He did not think it could be maintained that a girl brought herself under the category of those for whom reformatory schools were designed—namely, those who had been convicted of crime—even when she was a consenting party; but there could be no doubt that she took part in an act of great indecency, and might very properly be made the inmate of an industrial school. He, therefore, suggested that his hon. and learned Friend should amend the clause in the manner proposed.

Mr. STAVELEY HILL said, he should be happy to adopt the suggestion of his hon. Friend the Member for the University of Oxford (Mr. Talbot).

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK thought his hon. and learned Friend did well to accept the Amendment just proposed.

Mr. WARTON concurred very much with what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt), as it was quite clear that the Bill was drawn on the assumption that a girl under 16 was incapable of giving consent; and, that being so, he put it to the House why should that fact not be expressed in the clause? In Chapter 45 of the Act 3 & 4 *Vict.*, it was expressly stated that consent was no defence where the girl was under the age of 13; and if were not so stated here it might be held that the girl could consent. He quite agreed with the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) that a great many girls under the age of 16 knew quite as much as the boys, and often a great deal more.

Mr. PICTON thought the clause would introduce a very dangerous principle into their law, as it would constitute about the only case in which a person might be committed to a period of confinement without being first tried. The clause would enable the Judge, on the conviction of any prisoner charged with an offence against a girl under the age of 15, to inquire of the jury whether they found that the act was done with the consent of the girl; and without the girl having been called upon to plead, but on a mere side issue like this as to the impression in the minds of the jury, the girl might be deprived of her liberty for two years. He thought that to adopt this clause would be to introduce a very bad and a very dangerous precedent. The object of this part of the Bill was to treat young girls as not having the right to consent; and he hoped the House would not come to a contrary conclusion by raising the assumption of consent.

MR. W. S. ALLEN said, the effect of adopting the clause proposed by the hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Staveley Hill) would be to render that part of the Bill absolutely nugatory, because parents would never come forward to prosecute where they saw there was a chance of having their own children punished. He could hardly imagine any clause that would work more cruelly or unjustly.

Question put, and *negatived.*

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he rose to move a clause he had put upon the Paper——

MR. WARTON rose to Order. He wished to ask whether the clause about to be moved by the hon. Member for Northampton, and which dealt with a totally different class of offence to that against which the Bill was directed, was within the scope of the Bill?

MR. SPEAKER: At this stage of the Bill anything can be introduced into it by leave of the House.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, his Amendment was as follows:—After Clause 9, to insert the following clause:—

"Any male person who, in public or private, commits, or is a party to the commission of, or procures or attempts to procure the commission by any male person of, any act of gross indecency with another male person, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and, being convicted thereof, shall be liable, at the discretion of the Court, to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding one year with or without hard labour."

That was his Amendment, and the meaning of it was that at present any person on whom an assault of the kind here dealt with was committed must be under the age of 13, and the object with which he had brought forward this clause was to make the law applicable to any person, whether under the age of 13 or over that age. He did not think it necessary to discuss the proposal at any length, as he understood Her Majesty's Government were willing to accept it. He, therefore, left it for the House and the Government to deal with as might be thought best.

New Clause (Outrages on public decency,)—(*Mr. Labouchere,*)—*brought up,* and read the first and second time.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he did not wish to say anything against the clause; but he would point out that under the law as it stood at the present moment the kind of offence indicated could not be an offence in the case of any person above the age of 13, and in the case of any person under the age of 13 there could be no consent.

SIR HENRY JAMES said, the clause proposed to restrict the punishment for the offence dealt with to one year's imprisonment, with or without hard labour. He would move to amend the clause by omitting the word "one," in the last line of the clause, and substituting the word "two."

MR. LABOUCHERE had no objection to the Amendment.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to,* and *added* to the Bill.

MR. LABOUCHERE said, he did not know how the next clause, put down in his name, as to the cessation of parental authority, had got upon the Paper. He supposed it was by some accident; but as he did not intend to move it, he would, with the permission of the House, move the clause following it—namely—

"In cases where it is proved to the satisfaction of the Court that the seduction or prostitution of a girl under the age of sixteen has been encouraged, facilitated, or favoured by her father, mother, guardian, master, or mistress, it shall be in the power of the Court to divest such father, mother, guardian, master, or mistress, of all authority over her, and to appoint any person or persons willing to take charge of such girl to be her guardian until she has attained the age of twenty-one, or any age below this as the Court may direct."

He would explain the object of this clause as briefly as he could. Let the House suppose the case of a girl of, say, 13 years of age, whom someone had been prosecuted for outraging, and that, in the course of the proceedings, it had been shown that the parents had favoured and facilitated the seduction or prostitution of the girl, it seemed to him a most monstrous thing that that girl should be sent back to the care and custody of her parents. When the Bill was in Committee he had brought forward a clause somewhat to the effect of the present proposal; but it contained the provision that the girl should be sent to a reformatory, and, no doubt, there were certain objections to that course—objections which had been urged just now to the clause proposed by the hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (Mr. Staveley Hill). It would be seen that by the present clause it was proposed that the Court should be allowed—

> "To appoint any person or persons willing to take charge of such girl to be her guardian."

That provision would allow the Court to send the girl to one of the homes which were being kept up for purposes of charity, if such home were willing to receive her. He had received a letter from Miss Webb, the Lady Superintendent of the Chatham Lock Hospital, in which that lady said she wished to state a fact in regard to the hon. and learned Member for Stockport's (Mr. Hopwood's) opposition to the proposal that the custody of any girl under 16 being placed in any other hands than those of her parents. A few years ago a girl under 16 and her mother were in Miss Webb's hospital at the same time. The mother was discharged first, and the girl asked Miss Webb to put her in a home unknown to her mother. This was done, and the mother went to Miss Webb and abused her, and afterwards applied to the magistrates in order that she might recover the child for purposes of prostitution. The mother took the girl out of the house, and she was soon on the streets again, and was now keeping one of the worst brothels in Chatham.

New Clause (Custody of girls under sixteen,)—(*Mr. Labouchere,*)—*brought up,* and read the first and second time.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he was sorry he was unable to approve of the insertion of the clause as it appeared on the Paper. He must remind the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) that it was open to the objection pointed out by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) in the discussion that had taken place on another clause, inasmuch as it dealt with the position of the parents, and would override the obligation of the father and mother, which was a matter with which the Bill did not deal, and was not intended to deal. He could not think it would be a wise thing to attempt to deal with this question in the manner proposed by the clause.

MR. GREGORY said, there was a good deal to be said in favour of this clause which, in the event of it being shown to the satisfaction of the Court that the parents or persons having control of the girl were, for the reasons stated, morally unfit to have such control any longer, enabled the Court to divest them of such control and to appoint as guardian any other person or persons willing to take charge of her. Well, he thought that was not an unreasonable proposal, because there were many persons and many institutions which, under the unfortunate circumstances described in the clause, would be willing to provide for a girl at the period of life named. It was simply to give those persons or institutions the power of guardianship over the child —to give them that legal authority which, as the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) had pointed out, they would not have if the Amendment were not adopted. On the whole, he was inclined to support the clause.

MR. HOPWOOD said, he thought there was a great deal of difficulty in the way of accepting the clause as it stood. No procedure, no forms were provided. The jurisdiction of the Court was not defined. He hardly thought that either the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) or the hon. Member for East Sussex (Mr. Gregory) had considered that point. It would appear that somebody had to get up and ask the Judge to let them have the body of the child; but there was no means provided which would allow the Court to form its mind in the matter. What was it that the hon. Member proposed to put on the Court to deal with? He had formulated no procedure for the Court to be guided by, and he (Mr. Hopwood) said therefore that the clause was a mere *brutum fulmen*, and that they would be stultifying themselves if they inserted in the Bill these benevolent but crudely expressed intentions.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he was very much in favour of this clause, although he could not see exactly how it would work. It was true enough, as his hon. Friend said, that the persons referred to in the clause ought not to be guardians of the child under the circumstances. No one doubted that; but it would require a great deal of consideration before the clause could be properly elaborated. Suppose the Court deprived the parents of the guardianship, and suppose it was given to a person whom they would assume to be an excellent person—what if that person died in the following week? That was an important consideration. Then, again, suppose that, the new guardian being appointed, the child were to run away, the new guardian would have no power to compel the child to go back again, and the parents, he presumed, would return to their obligation to support the child.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, the parents, at all events, would be liable for the support of the child under the existing law; if children were taken into the workhouse the parents were liable for their keep. But if this clause became law, and if the parents were as bad as they were supposed, they might not be unwilling to facilitate evil practices, when they knew that they could get rid of their responsibility.

MR. M'LAREN pointed out that this difficulty would vanish if there were power given to anyone to take out a summons to make the child a ward of Court.

MR. ELTON said, he should support the proposal of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). He wished to point out that the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) had in the course of his observations departed from the obvious meaning of the clause by reading it as if the Court might declare a fit person to take charge of the child; whereas the clause distinctly stated that it was for the purpose of enabling the Court to appoint a guardian. That was perfectly legal language. The matter turned on the old question, "what was a guardian and what was not?" With regard to the question as to what was to become of the child if the guardian appointed by the Court were to die—why, then the Court could appoint another. [Sir HENRY JAMES: No.] He thought the Court could do so. Finally, as to the feeding the child. Of course, the parents' obligation to do that would remain, whether there was a guardian appointed or not. For those reasons he should vote for the clause.

MR. DILLWYN said, he hoped the House would agree to the proposal of the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere). He believed that the only chance of rescuing girls in the position described was to take them away from their natural guardians who had violated their trust. He hoped his hon. Friend would divide the House on his Motion, in which case he should feel it his duty to support him.

MR. THOROLD ROGERS said, he was always alarmed when the occupants of the two Front Benches united in saying that a clause which was sound in principle was unworkable in practice. He maintained that it was the duty of the Government for the time being, when a clause was accepted in principle, to find out means by which it could be made to work. A case had been referred to by the hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) to which the proposed clause would very properly apply. But he (Mr. Rogers) remembered a case more fitting than that. It was a case of a man convicted of a criminal assault on his two children. Although the man had a severe sentence passed upon him his parental rights survived, and the Guardians of the Poor had to get the consent of this very man —this abominable villain—to send the two children out of the country. Application was made to the Local Government Board on behalf of the children of this wretch; and the Local Government Board informed the Guardians that they—the Guardians—could not find the means for allowing the children to emigrate. But the Guardians, he might say, broke the law, and he thought rightly. They sent the children away. He wanted to know what was to be the remedy in cases of abomination like that? It was a far stronger case than that which had been brought forward by the hon. Member for Northampton. His experience was that parental rights should cease when they were neglected or violated in the manner described in the clause. This was a single case, and the hon. Member for Northampton had touched on one of a similar character. It was perfectly well known that there were a number of wretches in the country who would commit outrages on their own children, and then insist on their parental rights.

MR. A. M'ARTHUR said, he hoped that the hon. Member for Northampton would press the clause on the House. Unfortunately, there existed a number of dissipated parents who sent their children into the streets, and encouraged them to become prostitutes. In the interests of children this clause was, in his opinion, one that ought to be accepted, in order that they should not be left under the control of such parents—human beings only in name.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, he thought it would meet the desire of the House if some such clause as that proposed by the hon. Member for Northampton could be accepted. With that object, he believed, if they put their hands to the work, they would be able to frame a clause that would probably receive the approval of the House. He therefore suggested that one way of dealing with the objections raised to the clause would be to insert these words—

> "And the High Court of Chancery shall have power from time to time to rescind or vary such order or appoint any other person or persons as guardians."

It was, he thought, advisable that those words should be introduced. He supposed the case of a good father and bad mother; if the father died, the question would arise whether the child should go back to the mother.

Mr. LYULPH STANLEY said, it appeared to him that the clause was right in principle, and that it might be worked on the lines of the present law, which allowed any girl who was an inmate of a brothel, and under 14 years of age, to be sent to an industrial school. There was, in his opinion, no moral difference between keeping a girl in a brothel and a parent making a profit by putting his child in the way of vice; and therefore he thought that the machinery of the industrial schools might be very properly used in this case, although he could quite understand the feeling of some hon. Members in not wishing to bring the industrial schools under the provisions of the proposed clause. It could, however, be done with safety, subject to certain restrictions. There was, of course, a distinction to be drawn in the case of a girl whose father or mother were not fit to be entrusted with her guardianship. He thought that this suggestion would meet one of the difficulties that had been referred to in the course of this discussion, because when a child was sent to an industrial school an order could be made for the maintenance of the child, and therefore the parents would not get rid of their obligation to contribute to its support. It would, however, be necessary to provide that the parents' right of custody should cease in the case of children sent to industrial schools, because it was a well-known fact that parents who were very worthless came to the doors of the schools in order to get possession of children the moment they reached the age of 16, and return them to the paths of vice. He thought that the machinery of the industrial schools would be the best that could be used in respect of the custody of the children in question.

Mr. WARTON said, he thought hon. Members were by degrees coming to something like an agreement on this subject. The hon. Member for Northampton (Mr. Labouchere) had, however, used singularly infelicitous words in speaking of "seduction and prostitution." He thought it would be more correct if the clause ran—

> "In cases where it is proved to the satisfaction of the Court that the abduction of the girl under the age of sixteen has been encouraged, facilitated, or favoured by the father, mother, guardian, &c."

but then, again, the word prostitution was used improperly. It seemed to him that the cases contemplated by the 4th and 5th clauses of the Bill were not cases of seduction or prostitution; and he ventured to suggest most respectfully that it would be better to alter some other clause of the Bill, and say "when on trial under the 4th and 5th sections of the Act." That would get rid of the incongruity of words.

Mr. DAVENPORT said, it appeared to him that the difficulty with regard to the question of guardians had been disposed of by the discussion which had taken place. Although he agreed with the hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Lyulph Stanley) that the provisions of the Industrial Schools Act should be applied under this clause as far as empowering the Court to compel the parents to contribute to the maintenance of a child under the care of a guardian, he protested against those children being sent to industrial schools. He thought they might be sent to reformatories, but not to these schools; and he said that in the interest of the children in the schools, some of whom were thieves, but who, for the most part, had not committed any offence against the law, but simply broken away from the control of the parents. He thought it would work most injuriously to them to introduce a number of girls of the character possessed by those dealt with in the clause. If the clause of the hon. Member for Northampton were read a second time, he hoped the Amendment suggested by the late Attorney General (Sir Henry James) would be introduced; and he would also amend the clause by giving power to the Court to make an order on the parents for the payment of such sums and on such conditions as the Court might think fit.

Question, "That the Clause be read a second time," put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed,

In line 1, to leave out the words "In cases where," and insert the words "Where on the trial of any person for an offence under this Act."—(*Sir Henry James.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. J. G. TALBOT suggested that instead of the words "seduction and prostitution" the word "defilement" should be substituted.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, the alteration would be unnecessary, because they had agreed to insert the words—"Where on the trial of any person for an offence under this Act."

Amendment proposed,

In line 3, after the word "guardian," to insert the words "by any person having the lawful charge or authority over such girl."—(*Mr. J. G. Talbot.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir Richard Webster) said, he thought that "father and mother" ought certainly to stand in. Whether it was necessary to insert the words proposed by the hon. Member for the University of Oxford (Mr. J. G. Talbot) it was for the House to consider; but, certainly, he did not think it would be right to leave out father or mother or guardian.

Mr. STAVELEY HILL thought it would be sufficient if they said "father, mother, guardian, master, or mistress." He did not think "step-father or step-mother" was at all necessary.

Mr. LABOUCHERE said, he would explain the way in which this clause had been drafted. He had had some doubts on the matter, and he had taken it to one legal gentleman who drew it up. Then he had taken it to another legal gentleman, who had said, "Oh, he's a fool," and had drawn up another clause. If he had taken it to 20 other legal gentlemen he had no doubt he would have had 20 different opinions.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Mr. DAVENPORT then proposed, at the end of the clause, to add the words—

"And the Court may make an order upon the parent for the payment towards the expense of the maintenance of the girl of such sum, and under such conditions, as to the Court may seem right."

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, the hon. Member must give the power under the Industrial Schools Act. They must have some machinery.

Mr. BROADHURST said, he would like to know who the money was to be paid to?

Mr. DAVENPORT said, that was to be left within the discretion of the Court.

Mr. ONSLOW thought it would be hardly enough to say "the parent," for the child might not have a parent. It should run "parent, guardian, master, or mistress."

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT was afraid that was a fatal objection, as it would be impossible to enforce the penalty against anyone but the father or the mother.

Mr. BRYCE pointed out that this was an order that might be made behind the back of the father; and, therefore, they must put in some provision to enable him to apply to have such an order rescinded.

Mr. DAVENPORT said, he was willing to withdraw the Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Sir HENRY JAMES proposed to add, at the end of the clause, these words—

"And the Court shall have the power from time to time to rescind or vary such order by the appointment of such guardian or in other respect."

He had not much faith in clauses drawn up in this hurried manner; but he had done his best to meet the views of the House.

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, he would not divide the House on the clause; but he would repeat what his right hon. and learned Friend opposite (Sir Henry James) had said. It was not a practicable clause, and it was a mistake to insert it in the Bill.

Clause, as amended, *added.*

MR. STAVELEY HILL begged to move the following new clause:—

> "Every person selling, circulating, or distributing, or writing, printing, or publishing, with a view to such sale, circulation, or distribution, any matter or thing calculated or tending to debauch, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and, being convicted thereof, shall be liable to be imprisoned for a period of not more than two years, and to be fined a sum not exceeding two hundred pounds, and all such writing, prints, or publications shall be seized and destroyed."

The offence which this clause aimed at should, in his opinion, be punishable with two years' imprisonment and the imposition of a fine not exceeding £200. Such a clause as that was necessary at this time, which during the tenure of Office by the present Home Secretary had become the Augustan era of obscene literature. Just recently a newspaper, failing in its circulation, and having a very great difficulty to maintain its own in the world, thought by a very sensational report to regain its circulation——

MR. BRYCE asked whether the remarks the hon. and learned Gentleman was making were relevant to the issue he was putting before the House?

MR. SPEAKER said, that as far as the hon. and learned Gentleman had gone his remarks were certainly relevant.

MR. STAVELEY HILL said, this journal had invented for that purpose new fables and stories which, they might depend upon it, as every day went by, would be shown to be entirely false and groundless, by which there had been brought about a state of things which, he would venture to suggest, had done more than anything with respect to that which it had been said it was intended to prevent, towards debauching the minds of young people. It was no secret that not only in the streets, but in the most private room of almost every household in the country, this filthy literature had permeated without any attempt to control its circulation. "*Non olet,*" said the smug proprietor of this journal, as he shovelled tens of thousands of pounds into his pocket. "*Non olet*" he repeated, as he galvanized into life this wretched journal that was falling to pieces, and, by means of its circulation, produced an amount of prurient inquiry among those who otherwise would never have touched this matter at all, and who, but for this journal, never would have known it in any shape or way. Well, what was the state of things that existed? He said if this journal could not be punished it ought to be punished. If there was a state of things brought about tending to corrupt the mind, as stories of this kind must tend to by exciting the curiosity of young people, was there no law to prevent it? While they were now placing on the Statute Book a measure to purify the bodies of young people it was necessary, at the same time, that they should endeavour to purify their minds. He had hoped the law was such as to cause the journal in question to be prosecuted. He remembered a case of a very similar nature, where a book bearing the title *The Confessional Unmasked*, and published by a Protestant Body, professed to expose the errors of the Church of Rome. On its title page it stated that the practices described within would convert our Eden into a Sodom. The book was seized, its circulation was prohibited, and a prosecution was instituted, a course which should have been followed in the case of the journal in question. He would have thought that the fact of that publication having been prosecuted with success would have been enough to have induced the Law Officers of the Crown to consider that it would have been possible to have prosecuted in this case. He would read part of the Judgment of Lord Chief Justice Cockburn, who tried the case which he had mentioned. His Lordship said—

> "It is said that the respondent's purpose was not to deprave the public mind. Be it so; but then the question presents itself in this simple form. May you commit an offence against the laws in order thereby you may effect some ulterior object which you have in view, which may be an honest and even a laudable object? My answer is emphatically — 'No!' It seems to me, to adopt the affirmation of that view would be to uphold something which, in my view of what is right and wrong, would be most reprehensible. This book, we are told, is cir-

> culated at the corners of streets and in all directions; and, of course, it falls into the hands of all classes—young and old—and the minds of those hitherto pure are exposed to the danger of contamination and pollution from the impurity it contains. I think the old sound and honest maxim, that you shall not do evil that good may come of it, is applicable in law as well as in morals."

Well, now, he could not but think that it was a great pity that a step was not taken to stop the circulation of this paper, which had done an infinity of mischief. He knew these publications took place when there was practically no permanent Law Officer in the Government. The person who now occupied the Lord Chancellor's Office was in a condition of transit from one Office to another, and the present Attorney General had scarcely assumed Office. But, he said, the Home Secretary, with his knowledge of the evil that would come of it, ought to have stopped the circulation of this filthy paper. But the Home Secretary did not do so. He was bound, therefore, to assume that he did not believe the law was sufficient for the purpose; and, therefore, what he had to do was to furnish in this clause the power of dealing with such matters in the future. He believed that under Lord Campbell's Act he could only seize and destroy the journal and not punish the offender. Now, what he intended by this clause was that the offender should be punished. *The Pall Mall Gazette*, as a friend had pointed out to him, had, in one of its latest numbers, moralized in this manner—"Let us not too suddenly do away with prostitution, because by that means you would be taking away bread from those poor girls, and you would have to supply their means of living from Imperial funds." That was the view taken by a journal professing to be shocked at immorality. He could only suppose the Home Secretary had not prosecuted this journal because he thought the law was not sufficient. Under these circumstances, he entreated the House to pass this clause. He had seen a letter from a father of a family in Germany, who told him that this disgusting literature was largely circulated there, and among those who believed that the revelations truly represented the general state of things in England, and naming distinguished statesmen who were commonly said to be guilty of these crimes; and it was alleged that this was the reason that *The Pall Mall Gazette* had not been prosecuted. Then, he said, let them improve the law; let them see what was done in other countries. He found that in America they inflicted a fine of from £20 to £100, English money, with from one to five years' imprisonment, for selling obscene publications. Well, if that was the law in America, let it be the law in England also. Where there was printing, or publishing, or selling, or distributing any matter or thing calculated to debauch, let it be a misdemeanour. He was sure the House would not think he was too severe in suggesting that a person convicted of such a crime should be liable to imprisonment for two years, and to a fine of £200, and that the publication should be seized and destroyed. When a man, under the pretence of public duty, did this kind of thing in order to put tens of thousands of pounds into his pocket, and when he did it out of the pockets of poor people who were tempted to believe such stuff, and to the detriment of the pure-mindedness of the young, he thought it was high time to interfere and to punish him as he deserved, and if the "cat" were added it would be an improvement.

New Clause (Sale of matter tending to debauch a misdemeanour,)—(*Mr. Staveley Hill,*) — *brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Sir RICHARD WEBSTER) said, that after the somewhat impassioned speech of the hon. and learned Member who had just sat down it was necessary for him to say a few words. The hon. and learned Gentleman had read the Law Officers of the Crown a lecture on the law; but he could assure him it was altogether unnecessary in this case, as they were perfectly well acquainted with the law on this subject, and with the only authority the hon. and learned Gentleman had quoted. He took the responsibility of advising the Home Secretary in this matter. The whole case was most carefully considered by the Law Officers of the Crown and by still higher authorities, and the opinion they formed was formed upon the merits of the case, and with a perfect acquaintance with the law, and they came to the conclusion that it would not be a wise or prudent thing to prosecute *The Pall Mall Gazette* newspaper, and, as the Home Secretary had stated a few nights ago, they never deviated from that opinion. A prosecution of this sort had to be very carefully handled, as it very frequently aggravated the mischief. While he did not justify the tone and language of that paper, he contended that in such a case as this no one who was responsible would consider it a desirable thing to prosecute. Such prosecutions took a very long time, and did more to spread the mischief than anything else. [*A laugh.*] His hon. Friend might laugh; but he contended that there were circumstances in this case which would not render it desirable to prosecute. The law as it stood was quite strong enough, and did not require amendment; but he would like to call the attention of the House to what the hon. and learned Gentleman proposed. What did he propose? That anyone—

> "Circulating anything calculated or tending to debauch, shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and, being convicted thereof, shall be liable to be imprisoned for a period of not more than two years, and to be fined a sum not exceeding two hundred pounds, and all such writing, prints, or publications shall be seized and destroyed.

Well, for his part, he did not think that there was anything did more harm to the minds of young people than French novels. Did the hon. and learned Gentleman propose that the sale of French novels should be a misdemeanour? ["Oh, oh!"] Well, all he could say was that he considered that these cheap French novels were as calculated to debauch the minds of young people as anything else. He said that no amendment of the law was required; and certainly this was not the time to deal with such a matter, or with any other matter unless it was such a matter as was dealt with generally by the Bill, and, in any case, the Amendment would not be an amendment of the law, nor would it meet the case of the placing before the public matters that were obscene.

Mr. GEORGE RUSSELL said, he had no objection to this clause; but he took leave to enter his very strongest protest against the personal attacks which had been made upon the editor of a particular journal. He held no brief for that newspaper. He had frequently had to differ from it on political matters; but from a personal knowledge of the editor, whom he supposed to be the person aimed at, and who after all was responsible for this exposure, he felt bound to record his protest against the statement that he was actuated by any catch-penny motives, or by the mere desire of promoting the circulation of his paper. His primary idea was to carry out a great and much-needed moral reform which he saw was necessary, and it was a work which it was impossible to conduct without a certain departure from journalistic rule and style of language usually adopted in newspaper literature. For his own part, he believed that departure, though it might cause some evil, had been productive of an amount of good far in excess of the evil. As to the question of profit, he believed if the hon. and learned Member would examine the statement thoroughly he would see that, considering the great expense incurred, there could not have been the profit he imagined. As to the policy of the editor of *The Pall Mall Gazette*, he ventured to say that his policy had been abundantly justified by its result in that House. He believed most firmly that the measure was at one time in imminent peril; and when it was talked out by hon. Gentlemen opposite with ill-concealed satisfaction, the fact being gloated over by certain newspapers the next day as a proper dismissal of a mawkish measure, its chances of passing at the fag-end of the Session were infinitely small. He believed the enterprize of the editor of *The Pall Mall Gazette* had been the chief means by which the result arrived at that night had been obtained.

Mr. M'COAN said, he was sorry the hon. and learned Member opposite (Mr. Staveley Hill) who brought forward the clause had weakened its strength by pointing the moral of it at *The Pall Mall Gazette*. It was evident there was a great difference of opinion as to the action and motives of that paper, and as to the moral results of its recent "revelations;" but he thought he might have found justification enough for his clause in the class of obscene literature which had been thriving and circulating in London for many months before *The Pall Mall Gazette* had entered upon its crusade. He was sorry to hear from the Attorney General that the law as it stood was sufficient to deal with the circulation and dissemination of such literature, because, if that were so, the late Government had incurred a grave responsibility in not putting it down, and that responsibility now devolved upon the present Home Secretary for permitting the circulation of the vile trash they daily met with in most of their great London thoroughfares. Everyone who saw the vile publications which were placed under the eyes of young men and boys who walked down the Strand must have been struck by the impunity with which they were allowed to be circulated. And yet the Attorney General told them the present law was sufficient to put a stop to it. The hon. and learned Member who had moved the clause did not allude to that—his motive, apparently, being a personal one against *The Pall Mall Gazette.* He hoped the House would feel that it was the duty of the Home .Secretary to take action, not against *The Pall Mall Gazette,* but against these atrocious publications which were sold openly in the streets.

MR. ONSLOW said, he cordially supported the clause of his hon. and learned Friend. He was no lawyer, and, therefore, did not understand whether it was drawn up in legal phraseology or not. He had felt some surprise at hearing from the Attorney General, when he addressed the House that night, that the existing law was sufficient to put down immoral publications. That might be so; but he believed that the duty of prosecuting devolved upon no particular individual. As the law stood now, anyone could prosecute a newspaper proprietor or publisher for printing and circulating any obscene and vile literature; but surely, when Her Majesty's Government knew that these publications, and others worse even, were being sold broadcast in the streets, it appeared to him the duty devolved on the Government of putting a stop to them. But it was not only this vile letterpress which had been shocking and horrifying the country recently. That was bad enough; but hon. Gentlemen who walked the streets saw this *Pall Mall Gazette* literature reprinted and illustrated with filthy woodcuts. He would venture to say that in no country in the world had such indecency been seen as had distinguished the streets of London during the past few weeks. Moreover, he would inform the hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General and the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary that not only was it in London that this vile literature was sold, but that in many places of ordinary legitimate pleasure it was now purchasable by every country boy or girl who wished to possess it. He would ask the Home Secretary how long this sort of thing was to be allowed to go on? It was all very well to say that he or any other gentleman could prosecute; but who would take the trouble—who would go to the expense to do it? The duty must devolve upon the Government. His friends had told him that *The Pall Mall Gazette* had declared that the whole cost of the prosecution of this investigation only cost £300. It was absurd to say that this journal had put itself to any great expense. *The Pall Mall Gazette,* in the course of this wretched business, had had the countenance of gentlemen who ought to have known better. The hon. Gentleman the senior Member for Bristol (Mr. S. Morley) was one of those gentlemen who ought to have known better—he was one who ought not to have lent his countenance to the circulation of this paper by sitting on its Committee in concert with others. His hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Staveley Hill) had said that great mischief had ensued from this publication, and he (Mr. Onslow) was quite sure that the hon. and learned Gentleman was right. The obscene articles in *The Pall Mall Gazette* had contained exactly that information which many young girls wanted to know. The very things they wished to know were in it, so that these papers, when they got into their possession, would be handed from one child to another. How much longer was this thing to be allowed to go on? How long were they to have the streets of this City sullied with the filth and indecency of *The Pall Mall Gazette* and *Town Talk*—the streets of a City said to be in the highest state of civilization of any in the world? If it were the fact that this clause, if carried, would prove unworkable, he would press on the House the necessity of having some new clause framed to carry out the object in view. It was all nonsense to say that good would result from these publications—it was all nonsense to say that this indecency had been published from a good motive. [Sir ROBERT FOWLER (Lord Mayor): No, no!] The Lord Mayor behind him had peculiar views on many subjects. His (Mr. Onslow's) opinion was that this thing had not been done from a good motive, but that it had been done for pecuniary reasons, and that the editor of *The Pall Mall Gazette* was not the only person to blame. Other gentlemen who were anxious for a certain notoriety had embarked in it, and were equally to blame. One gentleman, who was spoken of as a very religious person, had a great deal to account for. He was endeavouring to make a great deal of money——

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member is wandering from the subject before the House, which is whether the law ought or ought not to be altered by the adoption of this new clause.

MR. ONSLOW said, it had been contended that the circulation of the literature of which he had been speaking would do more good than harm; but he did not believe it. His opinion, which he held most strongly, was this—that if there were some clause such as the hon. and learned Gentleman desired put in the Bill, they would do more to prevent prostitution than they were likely to do by all the rest of the Bill. Do not let girls of 13 or 14 know more than they heard or saw in their own homes—do not allow their minds to be polluted by this vile literature. He held this opinion most strongly, and, if the clause were not put in here, he hoped it would be put in in the House of Lords.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, it was getting very late, and he did not think they would be able to succeed in determining whether these publications had done more harm than good, or more good than harm, however long the debate was continued. The question was whether this clause should be put in the Bill. For his own part, he did not think it was wanted. He believed the law as it existed was amply sufficient. Some observations had been made as to whether or not the Government should undertake prosecutions of this kind; but he believed that a Government Press prosecution was about the most likely to fail of any in the world. If a prosecution was to be undertaken, it was better that anyone should undertake it than the Government. He himself had been, at one time, pressed to undertake such a prosecution—a prosecution which was undertaken in the end against *The Freethinker*. From his experience in connection with that case, he was sure that prosecutions of that kind undertaken by a Government were most likely to fail; therefore, he did not think the new clause was wanted.

SIR ROBERT FOWLER (LORD MAYOR) said, that after the reference which had been made to him by the hon. Gentleman below him (Mr. Onslow), he felt bound to say a word or two. It was all very well for the hon. Gentleman to denounce these special articles in *The Pall Mall Gazette;* but he had no doubt about it that the result of these articles had been to pass this Bill. The Bill had come down from the House of Lords. It was brought into this House on a Morning Sitting, and talked out; and he apprehended that if *The Pall Mall Gazette* had not drawn attention to the matter, there the Bill would have stood. There was then a change of Government, and the force of public opinion pressed the subject on the attention of the House. Therefore, whatever might be said about *The Pall Mall Gazette*, though he agreed with some of the observations of the hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow), he could not but feel glad that public attention had been drawn to the matter.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, the Government had taken this Bill in hand because of the publication of the articles in *The Pall Mall Gazette*, and had been determined to pass it into law. There had been quite sufficient evidence taken to satisfy the House of Lords and this House that something of the kind was wanted. When he had been asked about *The Pall Mall Gazette*, he had stated that the wiser course by far would have been, if the information was in the hands of *The Pall Mall Gazette*, to have brought it to the notice of the Secretary of State, so that he might have brought it before the House. It would then have had no effect on the people who heard it—it would not have had the effect of demoralizing the public. No one could regret more than he did that the publication had taken place. As to the non-prosecution of the journal in question, he did not wish to shirk responsibility in the matter. He had stated openly in the House that the best legal advice had been taken—not from the Law Officers alone, but from the Lord Chancellor. [Sir Henry James: He is a Law Officer.] Technically, but not practically. Acting on their advice, the Government had come to the conclusion that it would not be wise to prosecute in this case. From that determination they had never swerved. There were reasons, which he did not think he was bound to go into, why such a prosecution could not be undertaken. In the first place, there was no reasonable certainty of a conviction; then it might have involved waiting a long time, and have necessitated a long trial.

An hon. Member: How could it have done harm?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross): What would hon. Members have said to a long trial, going over 10 days or a fortnight, and all the details being published in the papers, and hawked about the streets, without anyone being able to prevent it? Thus, the increased publicity which the trial would have given to the obnoxious matter had also to be taken into consideration.

Mr. STAVELEY HILL said, it had been decided, in the case of Brennan and Steele, that the republication of indecent matter repeated in Court was in itself a misdemeanour.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, that in this case, at any rate, there would have been no right to punish anyone for this republication. So far as the proposed clause was concerned he did not think it would do any good, because he believed the existing law was strong enough to put down objectionable publications. If the hon. and learned Gentleman went to a division, he should have to vote against him.

Mr. THOROLD ROGERS said, he should like to say a very few words on this subject. He very much agreed with his hon. Friend opposite (Mr. Staveley Hill) in what he said about the publication of this paper. There were two ways of treating the subject dealt with by *The Pall Mall Gazette*—one was the language of the Old Testament, and the other was the language of M. Zola; and he left the House to determine in which method it was desirable to touch upon such a subject, or in which matter the editor of *The Pall Mall Gazette* had treated it. The question might arise whether it was not at times necessary to violate public modesty in the interests of public morality—whether it was not necessary to speak out plainly in order to make the Government act rigorously. How far it was the fact that in these matters, if the existing law had been put into operation, the greater part of the difficulty before them would have been met, he would leave those whose duty it was to put the law into motion to determine. It was clear that a great deal of injury had been done to the public morals latterly; but he felt convinced that if they did not act as they were trying to act now a great deal more harm would be done. He was convinced, from his experience of London, that there had never been a single feeling in it more profoundly startled than its moral sense had been by the recent exposure of vice. The exposure had to be made. He did not object to *The Pall Mall Gazette* making it, although he had not read that paper for a long time, regarding it as an odious journal in consequence of its habit of going in for vulgar and sensational articles. He had not read a word of it lately, and he wished a great many other people had not. If there was not a proper administration of the law as it at present stood, all he could say was that the Government were responsible for the detestable task of inviting the attention of the atrocities which went on in the Metropolis being undertaken by a public journal. There was another hateful paper called *Town Talk*, edited by someone who, if he rightly remembered, had been convicted and sentenced to two years' imprisonment for some previous indecency. He regretted that those concerned in the publication of this paper had not been taken in hand and punished. He had no doubt that the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross) was discreet in his dealing with these matters. No doubt, the right hon. Gentleman would adopt what he thought the best means to put down that which he believed to be atrocious and criminal vice. He (Mr. Rogers) believed, however, that the existing law, although the administrators of it had failed to put it into operation, was quite sufficient to repress this sort of thing, and he should be very sorry to see express legislation passed for the purpose of prosecuting this or that journal. He should not have said what he had if he had not intended to add that though *The Pall Mall Gazette* might have thought it its duty to take the course it had taken, it had done it in the worst possible manner. It had spoken of the vices of England in the most prurient language. It was a disgrace to the English Press, and, whatever indirect benefits might arise from it, he did not think any honest man could sit in the House whilst these matters were being discussed without denouncing the paper.

Mr. A. M'ARTHUR said, the hon. Member for Guildford (Mr. Onslow)—who, he was sorry to see, had left the House—had spoken harshly of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Bristol (Mr. S. Morley) and others in league with him, for their conduct on the Committee which investigated *The Pall Mall Gazette* charges, and the hon. and learned Gentleman who had moved the Amendment had stated that the whole story was false and frivolous. Now, the hon. and learned Gentleman had sat here when the Bill was last before the House, and must have heard the hon. Gentleman the Member for Bristol say that, so far from these accusations being false and groundless, the state of things was much worse than had been described. The hon. and learned Gentleman had said that thousands of pounds had been put into the pockets of the proprietors of *The Pall Mall Gazette*. Well, he (Mr. M'Arthur) was not there to defend the editor of *The Pall Mall Gazette*. He had not the pleasure of knowing him; but from what he had heard of him, and from what he had heard in connection with this case, he believed, notwithstanding all that had been said to the contrary, that that gentleman had acted from the purest motives and with the highest object, and that what he had done had had a great deal to do with the successful progress of the Bill. It was perfectly true, as the Home Secretary had pointed out, that this Bill had been prepared two or three years; but he was convinced that if it had not been for *The Pall Mall Gazette*, another year, at least, would have been allowed to elapse without its being passed. He had no doubt that considerable injury had been done by *The Pall Mall Gazette* by the publication of these articles; but he believed that the arousing of the people of the country to these abominations and terrible crimes would more than counterbalance any amount of evil that had been done.

Mr. STAVELEY HILL said, that after the complete repudiation they had heard of the course taken by *The Pall Mall Gazette*, he would not put the House to the trouble of a division.

Motion and Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH said, he begged to propose the following new Clause:—

"(1.) Every man who, in any thoroughfare or public place within the limits of the Metropolitan Police District, habitually or persistently solicits women or girls for immoral purposes, shall be deemed to commit an offence under section fifty-four of the Act of the Session of the second and third years of the reign of Her present Majesty, chapter forty-seven, intituled 'An Act for further improving the Police in and near the Metropolis.'

"(2.) Every man who, in any street within any town or district wherein section twenty-eight of 'The Town Police Clauses Act, 1847,' is in force, habitually or persistently importunes or solicits women or girls for immoral purposes, shall be deemed to commit an offence under the same section."

This clause was one which he thought was rendered absolutely necessary by the intolerable practice of insulting girls which had grown in this Metropolis to frightful dimensions. There were few subjects which excited the people out-of-doors more than the manner in which these girls were dealt with. With the permission of the House he would call attention to a few remarks which were made on this subject in the House of Lords last year by the Earl of Shaftesbury. It would put the whole case before the House as clearly and in much better language than he could, and would enable them to come to a right judgment on the subject; moreover, it was very brief. The noble Earl said—

"Hundreds—indeed, thousands—of women and girls were employed in the factories, workshops, and great houses of business far away from their homes. They returned home at all times of the night—some very late. Their Lordships should recollect that the many relaxations of the Workshops Act, granted by successive Secretaries of State, had greatly increased the mischief. Those employed at restaurants and railway refreshment rooms necessarily so. Their Lordships should hear the statements of these girls; they were beset on issuing from their places of work by vile and designing men, singly or collectively, who were on the watch for them, and who were there for no other purpose than to work their destruction. Many employers stated the same, and added that they gave protection as far as they could. These defenceless girls were fairly safe as long as they could keep together; but when obliged to separate, they were exposed to the most serious annoyance. But now women were to be subjected to far more fearful trouble. The law defining solicitation was to be altered, and the offence was to be determined by the judgment of the police constable. If a woman were seen speaking to a man, or being spokne to by a man, a constable could at once arrest the woman. Thus, a poor, innocent girl—timid, ignorant, defenceless—might be brought into a Court of Justice and ruined for life. Men were perfectly safe and enjoyed absolute impunity. The offenders were numerous, and were found in all parts of London, and many of them were well known to the Agencies with which he (the Earl of Shaftesbury) was connected. He had it on the authority of officers of the London City Mission that they were known and designated as 'night walkers,' and, frequently, missionaries and others had interfered to save the girls from brutal assaults. His proposition was very simple and very just; it was no more than to place the men on an equality with the women, and to say that any man soliciting habitually or persistently should be subject to the same penalties as these wretched women."—(3 *Hansard*, [288] 410-11.)

Those words, he (Mr. S. Smith) thought, placed before the House very fully the nature of his clause and the necessity for it. So far as he understood the law, at present there was nothing to prevent a man from insisting on walking home night after night with a young, innocent girl—insisting on talking to her all the way even in an insulting manner, and unless he made an attack on her it was impossible for her to have legal protection. Cases had come before his notice of most cruel hardship in this way, and he felt it was an absolute necessity that the House should deal with the question, and that men should be placed on the same footing as women in regard to these dastardly offences. He should not now do more than move the clause.

New Clause (Habitual solicitation,)—(*Mr. Samuel Smith,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be now read a second time."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, there was a great deal to be said for the view the hon. Gentleman the Member for Liverpool had taken; but the House would remember that when they were in Committee on this matter it was agreed on all sides that the "Street Clauses," as they were called, were not to be entered upon in this Bill. That was the clear understanding, and when Clause 9 was struck out by both sides of the House without a division—by common consent—it was understood that they should not enter on the Street Clauses at all. If they were now to proceed with them, he should look on it as a distinct breach of the understanding entered into with those hon. Gentlemen who were not now in the House that they should not deal with the matter. He had had communication by letter with the Earl of Shaftesbury on this matter, and the noble Earl, no doubt, feeling convinced that it would imperil the Bill to deal with these clauses at this period of the Session, had given him his full sanction to withdraw them. The clause would open up the whole subject-matter that the Committee refused to enter upon, therefore he opposed the Amendment.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT quite agreed with the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department. He was absent from the House when Clause 9 was dropped, and if he had been in the House he should have had something to say with regard to the dropping of it. It was disgraceful to witness the state of the streets, and he was extremely sorry that something could not have been done by Clause 9 to have remedied the existing state of things. However, it was only a small part of the Bill, and anything that would tend to jeopardize the measure as a whole, he, for one, was not prepared to support. Therefore, he was reluctantly compelled to acquiesce in it.

MR. BROADHURST wished to know whether the present law was not sufficiently strong to deal with the question? He remembered a case a short time ago in which the police arrested a man, and he was sent to prison for two months for annoying some young women. There was another case also of a County Justice who had been bound over in very heavy penalties to keep the peace towards a lady. It would be well if the Law Officers of the Crown could give the House some information on this point.

Question put, and *negatived.*

MR. CALLAN begged to move the following Clause:—

> "Any failure on the part of an official of State, or a superior officer of police, to act upon a complaint with reference to keeping of a disorderly house, or any offence against this Act, made to him by any of his subordinates, shall be a misdemeanor, and that, if any officer of police is censured by his superiors for making a charge or report against any house of being a 'disorderly house' within the meaning of this Act, directed against the keeping of brothels, the said officer so censured shall, on demand being made by him, be entitled to a public inquiry into the truth of his charge or report for which he may have been censured."

On the previous day he had intended to call the attention of the House to the misconduct of—thank God!—the late Home Secretary, in regard to such offences as it was intended should be dealt with in this Bill. When the facts of the case became known there would be a feeling of thanksgiving throughout England that he was no longer in his late position. What was this case of Mrs. Jeffreys? She was charged with keeping a brothel by an Inspector named Minahan—with keeping a brothel for the aristocracy; but that was to some extent a mistake, because, from the evidence adduced, he was able to say that it was largely supported by what he might call the wealthy Members of the Radical Party. He contended that the foreign traffic in young girls went on while the Home Office was under the management of the late Home Secretary, and the facts were fully reported in a paper called *The Sentinel.* He complained that Inspector Minahan had been dismissed from the Police for reporting the character of the houses Mrs. Jeffreys kept, and that cast the greatest reflection upon the Home Office, because they knew the Home Office was responsible for the conduct of the police. He had risen that night merely to bring forward the manner in which this Inspector Minahan had been treated by the Home Office, and he would point out that the case of Minahan and the Home Office and the case of Mrs. Jeffreys were mixed up in a most extraordinary manner. Minahan was substantially dismissed for proceeding in the Jeffries case. He found that in the month of May the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. J. Stuart) asked the then Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir William Harcourt) whether it would be right to lay upon the Table of that House the shorthand notes of the case, and whether he would allow an inquiry by that House into the matter, and also into the case of Minahan? The then Home Secretary said that he would lay the depositions on the Table, but he had not done so. Then the right hon. Gentleman had said that this was the matter which he wished to call the attention of the House to —"that the case of Minahan had been brought before him a year ago, and he was satisfied with the Superintendent's Report. But he would point out that these were the very parties who were interested in the Minahan case; they were the very people who, if Minahan was right, they were wrong. Minahan had stated that he was practically dismissed for reporting that Mrs. Jeffreys' houses were kept as brothels for the aristocracy, and had demanded an inquiry. Now, he (Mr. Callan) reiterated that charge. He charged the police with having connived at—and having connived at with the late Home Secretary—hushing up the case of Mrs. Jeffreys. Now, that was a specific charge, and if an inquiry were granted he would be prepared to sustain it. It was a shame that the Home Office had not taken up the case. On the 3rd of August he had asked the Home Secretary a Question as to the way in which the case had been dealt with by Mr. Edlin, and he might say that the Home Secretary avoided that Question. In his reply on that occasion the Home Secretary said that he (Mr. Callan) had stated that the case was disgracefully conducted. He had said nothing of the sort. Then the right hon. Gentleman went on to point out that the case was conducted by the Chelsea Vestry. Well, that was a matter which he would refer to in a few moments. Now, what was the Jeffreys case and what was the conduct of the magistrates, what was the conduct of the police, and what was the conduct of this immaculate Chelsea Vestry. In October, 1884, informations were sworn to and laid before Mr. Partridge, at the Westminster Police Court, charging this woman Jeffreys with the same offence now charged, and made by the same parties who had eventually prosecuted. After 24 hours' consideration Mr. Partridge refused to issue a warrant for her arrest. "Leave the information with me" said this immaculate magistrate. The Vestry—this immaculate Vestry—for which the Home Secretary entertained such a high respect that he brought them forward in that House as an answer in regard to the case of poor Mr. Minahan, did not take the matter up. Neither did the police take it up, nor did the Home Office; nor did the Home Office instruct the Public Prosecutor to take it up. He might ask did this information reach the vigilant and acute Home Secretary? If it did not reach him, then the police failed in their duty; but if, on the other hand, it did reach him, then he said that he had deliberately failed in his duty and had been a discredit to the Office over which he had unfortunately presided. ["Divide! divide!"] It was no use to call "Divide!" He did not wish to be interrupted, because if he was he might say something unpleasant personally. Well, the woman was prosecuted, and the evidence—but he would not refer to the nature of the evidence. It was sufficient to say that she pleaded guilty under the advice of an able counsel, and a more disgraceful scene than was enacted at the time of her pleading guilty he must say he had never read. She was tried at the Middlesex Sessions before Mr. Edlin, the Assistant Judge. Mrs. Jeffreys, who was elegantly dressed, conferred with Mr. Montagu Williams, and the latter then came forward and made a statement. He might say that Mr. Williams had done his duty very well to this woman.

MR. ONSLOW rose to Order. Was not the hon. Member becoming too discursive?

MR. SPEAKER said, he had allowed the hon. Member to go on, but it appeared to him that under cover of moving a new clause he was re-trying a case which had already been settled by a Court of Law. He might raise the case as an illustration of his argument; but to discuss it at great length in the manner he was doing, was going beyond the limits of debate and would be entirely out of Order.

MR. CALLAN said, he would compress his remarks into the very smallest compass out of deference to what had fallen from the Chair, and from his own inclination. He had merely quoted these matters to show the necessity for having someone responsible to that House and the country in such cases as this. Mr. Williams passed on to a variety of matters which he (Mr. Callan) would not go into. The sentence passed on that occasion drew the attention of the public to the matter, and it was a matter of comment at the time that many of Mrs. Jeffrey's clients were of the highest order. He would not name the clients, although he could do so, having the names in his possession. It was not considered prudent by the authorities to allow the case to go so far. He quoted the words of *The Echo* as emphasizing in the strongest way his own feelings in the matter. That paper said that the authorities made no complaint; that so far as the Home Secretary and the police authorities were concerned Mrs. Jeffreys might have continued to carry on this horrible trade as she had done for 27 years, and that at the preliminary examination it was shown that the Inspector who reported this house to his superiors was told to hold his tongue.

MR. SPEAKER: I have now to ask the hon. Gentleman to concentrate his remarks upon the new clause. His course is quite unusual, and I ask the hon. Gentleman not to refer to cases which have already been decided.

MR. CALLAN said, he contended that the law could be put in force, and that the way in which it should be done depended on the police and the Local Authorities. Mrs. Jeffrey's case had been brought before the Local Authorities by Mr. Rowlands, a member of the Vestry, but without effect.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall be very sorry to ask the hon. Gentleman to resume his seat on the ground of irrelevance; but if the hon. Gentleman does not move the clause or speak with reference to it, I must ask the House to support me in enforcing the ordinary Rule of Debate.

MR. CALLAN said, in that case he would refer to the answer given the other day by the late Home Secretary to a Question he had put to the right hon. Gentleman—he gave as his answer that he had inquired with regard to the case, and found that on inquiry the charges were proved to be baseless. That was why he (Mr. Callan) wanted the second part of his clause accepted which provided "that if any officer of police were censured by his superiors for making a charge or report against any house of being a 'disorderly house' within the meaning of the Act, the officer so censured should on demand being made by him be entitled to public inquiry into the truth of the charge or report for which he may have been censured." The late Home Secretary had stated that the charge he was referring to was a baseless charge. He would produce the evidence on which that charge was made.

Mr. SPEAKER: I must inform the hon. Gentleman that he is now entering into debate on a series of answers given in this House on a previous occasion which have nothing whatever to do with the Question before the House. If the hon. Member wishes to move the clause standing in his name he is at perfect liberty to do so; but I must warn the hon. Member that if I have to interpose again it will be to request him to resume his seat on the ground of irrelevance.

Mr. CALLAN said, he charged the Home Office with having a full knowledge of the facts. There was evidence that since the trial Mrs. Jeffries had continued to carry on these infamous practices. He said that if the Home Secretary did not take action when he had his attention drawn to such cases as these he ought to be held guilty of a misdemeanour. He had evidence that during the progress of the trial officials connected with the Home Office visited Mrs. Jeffreys' establishment, he supposed, for the purpose of reporting on the case, and he wanted to know whether there was at the Home Office any record of their Report? He repeated that he charged that for years the late Home Secretary and the Home Office knew that these houses had been carried on. Mr. Minahan had been dismissed for making a charge that was said to be baseless. But the police had themselves reported on the improper character of these houses; and before the late Home Secretary said that the charge was without foundation he should at least have examined the records in the Police Office. There was a Report which had been suppressed; and he said that the suppression of Reports of the kind ought to be made a misdemeanour, and that if the Home Office received it and did not act upon it their conduct was so improper that the official of the Department who was responsible should be held to be guilty of a misdemeanour. In the month of April——

Mr. SPEAKER: I have allowed the hon. Member the fullest latitude in his remarks, and I must now ask him to resume his seat on the ground of irrelevance and tedious repetition.

Mr. WARTON said, that from its title the Bill would seem to range over the whole Criminal Law. But as that was not the purport of the Bill, he would suggest that the words "Criminal Law Amendment" be struck out, and the words "Women and Girls Protection Act" substituted.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 5, to leave out the words "Criminal Law Amendment," and insert the words "Women and Girls Protection,"—(*Mr. Warton,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, the point was worthy of consideration; but he would propose that they should negative the Amendment, and the Government would state what they proposed to do in the matter.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Further Proceeding on Consideration of Bill, as amended, *deferred* till *To-morrow.*

LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) [ADVANCES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise Advances out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, of any sum or sums of money not exceeding £5,000,000 in the whole, to enable the Land Commission in Ireland to make Advances for the purchase of estates, in pursuance of the provisions of any Act of the present Session, for providing greater facilities for the sale of land to accupying tenants in Ireland.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

House adjourned at Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Friday, 7th August, 1885.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*First Reading*—Public Health (Metropolis) * (240).
Second Reading—Committee negatived—Metropolitan Police Staff Superannuation * (222); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) *; East India Army Pensions Deficiency * (239).
Committee—Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2) (235-241).
Committee — Report — Public Works Loans * (234).
Report — Third Reading — Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (170); Crown Lands * (224), and *passed*.
Third Reading—Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) * (231), and *passed*.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS BILL.

(*The Marquess of Waterford.*)

(NO. 170.) REPORT.

Amendment *reported* (according to Order): Then Standing Order No. XXXV. *considered* (according to Order), and *dispensed with*; Bill read 3ª, with the Amendment.

On Motion, "That the Bill do pass?"

Lord FITZGERALD, in rising to move the insertion of the new clause which was rejected at the previous Sitting by a majority of 1—the figures being, Contents 19, Not-Contents 20—said, it provided that the supply of water by the Dublin Corporation to the outlying townships should be increased from 20 to 25 gallons per head per day. When the arrangement was made, 16 years ago, the valuation of Bray was £17,600; now it was £26,000—an increase of nearly 60 per cent; so that the Corporation was receiving considerably more from Bray now than it did when the agreement was made. The population had only increased in that period 30 per cent; so that the advantage was clearly on the side of the Corporation, and not on that of the township. The case was similar in regard to the other townships. It was asked why the townships, if they wanted to obtain the increase now asked for, did not seek to bring in a Bill to effect their purpose; but they had no funds to meet the expenses of a Private Bill. There was nothing to fall back upon but the rates; and it was obvious that they could not contend with a wealthy Corporation like that of Dublin, whose power and wealth were increasing day by day. With the Corporation it was different. It was now promoting a Bill, the cost of which would be paid out of the Borough Fund; and, as this was a sanitary question, advantage was taken of the opportunity on the part of the townships to, if possible, induce the Corporation to confer a great sanitary advantage upon them. He (Lord Fitzgerald) had carefully looked into the Provisional Orders, and seeing the advantages conferred on the Corporation, he considered the townships were justified in asking that the Corporation should be compelled to do that act of justice that many of its own members were willing to concede. The question before their Lordships really was, whether they would not abide by the recommendation of their own Select Committee? He was now authorized to state that it was the unanimous wish of the Peers who had composed that Committee, that the clause he was now about to move should be agreed to, increasing the supply of water to the townships by 25 per cent.

Amendment *moved*, in page 1, after Clause 2, to insert the following Clause:—

> "For the purposes of the eighth section of the Dublin Corporation Waterworks and Fire Brigade Provisional Order, 1874, and of the Orders hereby confirmed, the statutable or contract allowance of water to the townships mentioned in that section shall be deemed to be twenty-five gallons per head per day, as provided by the Acts in that section mentioned relating to those townships respectively, and the said Orders and Acts shall be read and have effect accordingly."—(*The Lord FitzGerald.*)

Question proposed, "That the said Clause be there inserted."

Lord ARDILAUN said, that if there was one rule which was impressed upon their Lordships as one which should not be broken, it was the necessity of supporting the Reports of their own Committees. As regarded the subject under notice, he put it to their Lordships, whether they were not sticking to the letter rather than to the spirit of the Report of the Select Committee? The Bill was now in the form in which it left the Committee no doubt; but the noble Lord the Chairman of the Committee, and the noble Duke (the Duke of Marlborough), and other noble Lords, Members of the Committee, had stated to the House, that the opinion they had appeared to have expressed on the Report was not the opinion they had desired to give. The noble and learned Lord (the Lord Chancellor) had told them yesterday that it was too late, or something to that effect, to alter the Bill; but if that were the case, he (Lord Ardilaun) would ask what was the object of having these different stages of a Bill? Why should they have the first reading, the second reading, the Committee stage, Report, and third reading? Was it not that they might have so many opportunities of correcting faults and errors that might have occurred in the conduct of the Bill during those earlier stages? Unquestionably. When, therefore, they found that the Members of the Select Committee were now practically unanimous in declaring that they appeared to have made a mistake in their Report, and when it was remembered that the Committee was sitting until 7 o'clock at night, and that great obstacles in the way of the passage of the clause had been raised by the parties to the Bill, he did not think that the objection that it was now too late to alter the Bill should hold good. There had been insuperable difficulties in the way of the drafting of the clause before the Committee; though, if the Chairman himself had seen his way to draft it, the whole thing would have been at an end. He would call their Lordships' attention to the fact that the Acts on which the present water supply was based were passed 16 years ago, during which long time the Corporation had taken no steps to have these Acts altered. One of the clauses had been found unworkable in the interests of the Corporation, so the Corporation had come to Parliament to get it altered. Whilst they effected their purpose, it was but right that the townships should seek to obtain an alteration in the existing law, which was found to be disadvantageous to them. He earnestly supported the Amendment.

The Marquess of WATERFORD said, he was surprised that the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Fitzgerald) should have brought that matter again before the House, after the decision which had been given yesterday. It was said that the water supplied to the townships was sought to be cut down by the Corporation; but that was not the fact, and if the townships had been receiving more than 20 gallons per head per day, it was in excess of that to which they were entitled. The townships had the right under their own Local Acts, passed 16 years ago, to 20 gallons of water per head per day. They were to have that amount assessed on the number of the population, and all that the Corporation had done had been to desire to assess the population properly. There had been no means in Ireland of finding out what the population was; and all they asked for, in the present Bill, was that they should have those means, and that there should be a legal definition of the term "population" for the purposes of assessment. It was admitted that during the 16 years referred to, the townships had received a large number of gallons per head per day more than they were entitled to. The Corporation, however, on that account made no proposal to cut down the quantity of water supplied. It would remain as it was. The only proposal was that the townships should be limited to what they themselves arranged for 16 years ago, and that any water beyond that should be paid for at the rate of 2½*d.* per 1,000 gallons. Finding an opportunity of getting from the Corporation what they were really not entitled to—namely to have an additional supply of water without paying the 2½*d.* per 1,000 gallons chargeable for it — it was evident to him now that was what the opponents of the Bill meant. He would call their Lordships' attention to the fact that the proposal had only been brought before the Committee of the House of Lords at the last moment, and that it had never been submitted to the House of Commons Committee at all. He trusted their Lordships would not reverse the decision they arrived at yesterday, and throw out the Bill at the last moment. The House could only act upon what it saw, and that was, in this case, that the Bill was reported without Amendment; and though now it was said the Committee were unanimous in favour of the Amendment, yet they had practised an extraordinary method of showing their unanimity—namely, by neglecting to put in this clause. It was only as an afterthought that it was proposed. It would be most unfair to the Corporation of Dublin to accept it. It would have the effect of taking hold of the property of the Corporation, which was really the property of the people of Dublin. If they accepted the Amendment and broke down the existing law, as to the quantity of water to be supplied to the townships, they would also break down all those various Local Acts which had been reported to have been in existence for 16 years, for it proposed to allow an extra five gallons of water per head without increasing the charge. He would again say that he hoped their Lordships would not reverse the decision at which they arrived yesterday.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, that their Lordships had had the case most ably and clearly put before them, and after what had fallen yesterday from the noble and learned Lord (Lord Fitzgerald) and that day from the noble Lord (Lord Ardilaun), he was exceedingly surprised at the attitude taken by the noble Marquess who represented the Government in the matter (the Marquess of Waterford). They were accustomed to see so many changes in the attitude of Parties in Parliament that one was prepared almost for anything; but he certainly was not prepared to see the noble Marquess give such an extraordinary support as this to the privileges of the Corporation of Dublin. Such a circumstance seemed to him (the Duke of Marlborough) to be most remarkable. The injustice under which the minor townships were labouring had been clearly shown, and it was surely too much to say that that injustice should not be removed except at the expense of a special Act of Parliament. He put it to the Government that the unanimous decision of the Peers who had formed the Select Committee should be taken as a guide in this matter. As that was the only occasion of which the townships could avail themselves in order to obviate the injustice he had referred to, he should give his vote for the Amendment. If the House decided that the townships must, in order to obtain what they sought for, go through the expensive process of trying to get an Act of Parliament themselves, then it would be impossible for them to obtain a measure of justice. The only point the Committee had before them was whether they would take on themselves the responsiblity of inserting the Amendment; but they were absolutely unanimous as to the justice of the proposal.

On Question? Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 21; Not-Contents 19: Majority 2.

Resolved in the *affirmative*: clause *inserted* accordingly.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

TREATY OF BERLIN—ARTICLE X.—THE VARNA AND RUSTCHUK RAILWAY.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

LORD SANDHURST, in rising to ask the Prime Minister, Whether Her Majesty's Government propose to take any steps, and, if so, what steps, to insure compliance by the State of Bulgaria with Article 10 of the Treaty of Berlin, in so far as it refers to the Varna and Rustchuk Railway? said, that several Questions had been asked in the House of Commons on the subject; but the answers given had not been very reassuring. The action of the Bulgarian Government had been so dilatory as to be almost suggestive of bad faith. If it were a private individual or firm, there would be a method of dealing with it, and he could not see how the code of commercial honour of States differed from that of individuals. The Article of the Treaty of Berlin seemed in danger of lapsing; and, if one Article lapsed, the whole might do so, an idea in which Her Majesty's Government were hardly likely to concur. In asking the Question, he was actuated by no self-interest—he was not a shareholder, nor a Director—but, judging from the Blue Book, the conduct of Bulgaria was at variance with ordinary notions of commercial honour.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY, in reply, said, that the noble and gallant Lord opposite (Lord Sandhurst) had relied a good deal upon the Article of the Treaty of Berlin; but he (the Marquess of Salisbury) very much doubted whether that Article had precisely the bearing which appeared to have been suggested to the mind of the noble and gallant Lord. He did not gather from it that it gave any new rights to the

Company. The Treaty of Berlin transferred Bulgaria, so far as practical government went, from the Porte to the Prince of Bulgaria, and the Prince succeeded to the obligations which the Porte had assumed in respect of this railway. Therefore, the Railway Company had precisely the same rights against the Prince that it had against the Porte, neither more nor less. No doubt, the creditors of the Railway Company had been badly treated. Successive Governments in England had done what was in their power to bring about a satisfactory settlement of the long-standing claim of the Company; but those efforts had proved ineffectual, and the noble and gallant Lord seemed to think it strange they had not succeeded. No doubt, as the noble and gallant Lord had said, in this country a creditor could easily bring a debtor to book; but, among the inventions of modern times, a Bankruptcy Court as between nations had not yet been discovered, and, therefore, a process which would be easily applied to a private debtor in this country could not be applied to a State which did not fulfil its obligations. The noble and gallant Lord asked what steps were to be taken to insure the payment of the obligations of the State to the Varna Railway. "Insure" was a big word, and he did not know whether the noble and gallant Lord attached any military views to the idea, or whether he intended to carry out the analogy he had instituted, by issuing process against Bulgaria, and attaching the body of the Prince or those of the inhabitants. He (the Marquess of Salisbury) must say that none of those material methods appeared to be open to us, and we were left entirely to such moral influence as other nations of Europe and ourselves could exercise. He doubted whether it was incumbent upon us especially, or whether it was incumbent upon all the Signatories to the Berlin Treaty, to secure that proper effect should be given to the Article relied upon; but he earnestly hoped that, by the wisdom of the nations of Europe, some exhortations might be addressed to the Bulgarian Government sufficiently pressing to induce them to do more justice than they had hitherto done to these and to other creditors. He should be sorry to use any language which would separate his statement from those of his Predecessor (Earl Granville), which had been described as sympathetic, but not too encouraging on the subject. As to himself, he desired to offer the noble and gallant Lord who asked the Question all the sympathy in his power; but, beyond sympathy, he doubted very much whether he could promise any assistance. He could only say that all means that were open to the Government diplomatically they should gladly bring to bear so as to secure the equitable settlement of these long outstanding claims. It was much to be regretted that they had stood over so long. But, at the same time, it was only fair to say it was probable that the delay of the Bulgarian Government in making payment was to be attributed quite as much to financial embarrassment as to any indisposition to satisfy the demands of the Company. He should be glad to use his efforts to get the matter referred to arbitration, if he thought that arbitration could lead to any practical results; but it did not seem likely that it could do so. The matter should receive all the attention the Government could give to it; but he could not give any promise to insure the satisfaction of the claims of the Company.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

(The Marquess of Waterford.)

(NO. 235.) COMMITTEE.

Order of the Day for the House to be put into Committee read.

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD, in moving that the House do resolve itself into a Committee, said, that the object of the Bill was to render the Act of 1883 workable by removing some of the difficulties that had been found to exist in that Act. It was passed when Parliament was anxious to deal in a comprehensive manner with the housing of the Irish agricultural labourer, and contained some novel principles, which their Lordships always approached with great caution, and would only adopt in case of absolute necessity. He would first state shortly what provisions the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1883, contained. In the first place, it arranged that if 12 ratepayers, residing within a sanitary district, represented that the existing house accommodation for agricultural labourers was deficient, or unfit for habitation, the Sanitary Authority should call a meeting after 14 days' notice, and, if satisfied that such was the case, should pass a resolution, and make a scheme for improvement. The 12 ratepayers were to suggest the most suitable positions for the houses required. The Sanitary Authority, after having published a statement of the scheme in the months of September, October, or November, and served notice on the owner and occupier of the land which they proposeed to acquire, were to petition the Local Government Board, praying that an Order might be made confirming the scheme. With the Petition were to be sent maps and estimates of the proposed undertaking, and also a statement as to whether the owner or occupier dissented from the proposal. The Local Government Board were then to hold a local inquiry, and, if satisfied with the proposal, were empowered to make a Provisional Order sanctioning the scheme; but that Provisional Order would not take effect in cases where an objection was raised by owners or occupiers, or where three ratepayers had petitioned within the specified time against the scheme, unless it was confirmed by Act of Parliament. When that confirmation had been obtained, the Sanitary Authority were empowered to purchase the land compulsorily and carry the scheme into execution, and the Treasury was bound to advance the money, paying off the interest and principal in a certain number of years, in order to enable the Sanitary Authority to carry the scheme into effect. The Act had been found to be almost inoperative, and he was afraid it would be found, as time went on, more inoperative still. There were a number of schemes proposed; but so great were the difficulties of carrying them out, that very few houses were built, and, unless the Act were amended, there would be even fewer for the future. A Committee sat upon this question in "another place" last year, and obtained a great deal of valuable and interesting evidence, and upon its Report the present Bill was mainly framed. The reasons set out in that Report why the Act of 1883 was not workable were shortly these—that the expenses attending the working of the Act of 1883 were so enormous that they discouraged the Sanitary Authorities and Boards of Guardians from taking action in the matter, for fear they should place too great a burden upon the rates. In the first place, the Sanitary Authority was obliged to purchase the fee-simple of the land, and the cost of proof of title and conveyancing was very heavy, and entirely disproportionate to the size of the plot of land required, the cost being to all intents the same as if the Sanitary Authority was purchasing a large estate instead of half-an-acre. Secondly, the cost of Parliamentary confirmation which was incurred in every case where the scheme was opposed was very great. Thirdly, the rate of interest charged by the Treasury and the shortness of the maximum term allowed for repayment made the money borrowed a heavy charge upon the rates. Then, again, there were other causes which prevented the Act being put into operation. It obliged the Sanitary Authority to buy land, and build a new cottage upon it; but there was no provision made for repairing existing cottages, and allotting plots of land to them. Moreover, the arrangement which limited the service of notices to the months of September, October, and November was found not to be sufficient. It was shown in evidence, that the cost of building a cottage of a kitchen and two rooms, with all the sanitary arrangements required by the Local Government Board, would be about £70, and the legal and other expenses, including the purchase money, would come to some £35 more, making in all £105. The annual payment to the Treasury for 35 years for that sum would be something over £5 12*s.*, a sum which it would be perfectly impossible to expect an agricultural labourer, from the small wages he received in the greater part of Ireland, to pay in the shape of rent for his cottage and plot of land. About 1*s.* to 1*s.* 3*d.* was as much as an agricultural labourer could pay in Ireland; and, therefore, if that rent were put upon the houses, the rates would have to bear more than half the charge for 35 years, with the risk that if the house became untenanted, or the labourer became unable to pay even that rent, the rates would have to bear it all. The Bill got rid of many of these difficulties. In the first place, it got over the difficulty and expense of purchase by empowering the Local Government Board, with the consent of the Lord Lieutenant and Privy Council, to make a Provisional Order to enable the Sanitary Authority to take land compulsorily upon lease for 99 years, and limited owners were given power to grant such leases. There would be very little expense in taking such a lease compared with the expense of purchasing the fee-simple, and the rates would be saved to that extent. In cases of dispute, the Land Court was to fix the rent which was to be paid by the Sanitary Authority. If the land were liable to quit rent, Crown rent, or in the occupation of a tenant, the apportionment of such rent was to be settled by agreement. If not so settled, the Court was to apportion. The owner, if aggrieved, could obtain a re-hearing of his case by the Land Commission under the 44th and 48th sections of the Act of 1881. A Provisional Order made by the Local Government Board did not require to be confirmed by Act of Parliament, in cases where a Petition was lodged; but, instead of going before Parliament, arrangement was made that the petitioner's case be heard by the Lord Lieutenant and Privy Council, who then could confirm or reject the Provisional Order. The Lord Lieutenant in Council was to make rules for the procedure, the payment of fees and costs, &c. In addition to these provisions, the Sanitary Authority could purchase and put into repair any existing cottage, and add half-an-acre of land to it, or could take an existing cottage on lease. The time for serving notices of the improvement scheme, instead of being limited, as in the Act of 1883, to the months of September, October, and November, was, by the Bill, extended to the whole year. An Inspector of the Local Government Board was to report if a house were unfit for habitation, and the Sanitary Authority was to require the owner to repair it, or prevent it being further used. Anybody disregarding the order of the Sanitary Authority in this respect was liable to a fine not exceeding 10*s*. a-day. The definition of an agricultural labourer was revised and enlarged, and the term fixed for the continuance of the Act would be fixed at seven years from 1883, instead of for five years, the date named in the original Act. The Bill, he thought, was distinctly a step in the right direction. Its object was to provide house accommodation for one of the most deserving classes in Ireland; and it was hoped that, while these classes were by these means put into a state of comfort, indirect benefits would be conferred on all classes of society. The House had already assented to the principle by passing the Act of 1883, and ought, therefore, to pass a Bill which would give the labourers an Act which would really be workable. In some quarters a fear was felt that the measure might be used for political purposes; but he hoped that would not be the case, and there were provisions in the Bill that were intended to guard against such an unfortunate result. Should that precaution prove efficient, the Bill would be a real blessing to the class whom it was intended to benefit. The noble Marquess concluded by making the Motion of which he had given Notice.

Moved, "That the House do resolve itself into Committee."—(*The Marquess of Waterford.*)

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said, he wished to know whether the Bill was to enable Sanitary Authorities or others to build houses for the working classes, partly out of the rates and partly out of the public funds?

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD: No.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS: Well, out of the rates?

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD: Yes, out of the rates.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said, that the noble Marquess had spoken of the Bill as a step in the right direction. What was the terminus of the road along which the noble Marquess desired to travel? Was any limit to be imposed to the advance of money for such purposes?

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD said, that he must remind the noble Earl that this was not a new departure in legislation. He used the expression to indicate that the object of the Bill was simply to render operative an Act the principle of which their Lordships had accepted in 1883.

LORD FITZGERALD said, he perfectly agreed that the Bill was a step in the right direction with respect to a subject of considerable importance — the improvement of the condition of Irish agricultural labourers. That question had been a subject of controversy for the last 30 years. A Bill on the subject had been passed in 1857, but it failed; and several intermediate attempts had been made to deal satisfactorily with the question, but without success. No doubt, on large estates, and especially on that of the noble Marquess himself (the Marquess of Waterford), sufficient cottage accommodation was already provided by the landlords. But outside those estates the condition of the Irish labourers in regard to residence was a reproach to civilization, and it was impossible for any considerable advance in their well-being to be made unless their homes were greatly improved. He hoped their Lordships would pass the Bill, and thereby give a most deserving class a chance of advancing in prosperity and comfort.

Motion *agreed to:* House in Committee accordingly.

Clauses 1 to 11, inclusive, severally *agreed to.*

Provisional Orders.

Clause 12 (Provisional order may be confirmed by the Privy Council).

On the Motion of The Marquess of WATERFORD, Amendments made in page 5, line 12, after ("than") leave out ("twelve") and insert ("six"); in line 17, after ("not") leave out ("more") and insert ("less"); and in line 28, after the word ("Council") to insert the words ("after hearing the petitioner or giving him an opportunity of being heard.")

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 13 (Amendment of provisional orders made before this Act).

On the Motion of The Marquess of WATERFORD, Amendment made in page 6, after ("not") leave out ("more") and insert ("less.")

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 14 and 15 severally *agreed to.*

Clause 16 (Powers of the sanitary authority relative to purchase existing cottages, and allot land to existing cottages).

THE EARL OF COURTOWN moved, as an Amendment, to insert words to render it clear that the purchase should be by agreement.

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD said, that as this was a new Amendment proposed without Notice, he should be glad if the noble Earl would move it on Report.

Amendment (by leave of the Committee) *withdrawn.*

On the Motion of The Marquess of WATERFORD, Amendment made in page 8, line 22, at end of the line, add—

> "Provided also, that, except in the case of a tract of land in the neighbourhood of a town or village as aforesaid, a sanitary authority shall not let or permit to be held any land acquired by them under the said Act as amended by this Act to or by any person who is not also tenant to the sanitary authority of a dwelling-house."

On the Motion of The Earl of COURTOWN, Amendment made by omitting, in the same page, lines 24 and 25.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 17 (Closing of dwellings unfit for habitation) *agreed to.*

Clause 18 (Area of charge for rate levied by the sanitary authority).

LORD VENTRY, in moving an Amendment with the object of creating a right of approval to the Local Government Board against unjust assessment by Sanitary Authorities, said, that, unless the Amendment were accepted, it would be in the power of Boards of Guardians to favour particular districts at the expense of others.

Amendment *moved,* in page 9, line 36, after ("authority") insert ("subject to the approval of the Local Government Board.")—(*The Lord Ventry.*)

After some discussion,

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD said, that in deference to what appeared to be the sense of the House he would accept the Amendment.

Amendment *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 19 (Miscellaneous amendments of Act of 1883. 46 & 47 Vict. c. 60) *agreed to.*

LORD VENTRY, in moving the insertion of a new clause (19A), the object of which was to enable a landowner, from whom it was proposed to take land compulsorily, to offer, as an alternative, other land in lieu of that proposed to be taken, said, he believed it would make the Bill work much more smoothly, and would also tend to prevent its being used by Sanitary Authorities as an instrument of oppression.

Moved, To add, in page 10, after Clause 19, the following new clause:—

(Power to owner to propose alternative schemes.)

"When in execution of the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1883, after the completion of an improvement scheme, notice of the compulsory taking of any lands for the purposes of such scheme, or any part thereof, has been served upon any owner or reputed owner, and such owner or reputed owner in his answer to such notice states that he dissents to the taking of such lands, he may in such answer offer to the sanitary authority, instead of such lands, other lands of which he is the owner, and which lands he, with the consent of the occupier thereof, may agree to be appropriated to such purposes.

"On the consideration of the petition for the confirmation of such scheme, and of the local inquiry to be held in relation thereto, the offer of such owner and the propriety of accepting the same shall be considered, and if such offer shall be accepted the lands specified in such offer may be substituted for the lands originally sought to be taken from such owner compulsorily, and such substitution shall not be deemed to be an addition to the lands proposed in the scheme to be taken compulsorily."—(*The Lord Ventry.*)

The Marquess of WATERFORD said, he thought the proposal a fair one, and he would accept it.

Clause *agreed to*, and *added* to the Bill.

Lord VENTRY moved the insertion of a new clause (19B), the object of which was to insure a period of six weeks' notice to a landowner whose land it was proposed to take compulsorily.

Moved, to add, in page 10, after Clause 19A, the following new clause:—

(Limit of time for giving answers.)

"The time within which any owner, or reputed owner and lessee, or reputed lessee, of any lands served with any notice as to the compulsory taking of such lands for an improvement scheme under the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1883, may give an answer thereto, as required by the said Act, or by this Act, shall be six (6) weeks after the service of such notice." —(*The Lord Ventry.*)

The Marquess of WATERFORD said, that there was something fair in the proposal. If the noble Lord would make it 21 days he would accept it.

Lord VENTRY suggested a month.

The Marquess of WATERFORD said, he would accept the term as altered.

Clause *amended*, by leaving out, in line 6, the words ("six (6) weeks") and inserting instead the words ("one month.")

Clause, as amended, *agreed to*, and *added* to the Bill.

Lord VENTRY moved the insertion of a new Clause (19C), with the view of enabling the rents due for sites of cottages to be set off against rates due by the landlord in the electoral division in which the cottages were situated.

Moved, to add, in page 10, after Clause 19B, the following new Clause:—

"Any person liable to the payment of rates in any sanitary district, and entitled to receive any rents from the sanitary authority of such district in respect of any lands appropriated to any improvement scheme, may from time to time claim, by way of set-off against such rates, the whole or any part of such rents so far as the same had accrued due previous to the striking of such rates, and are payable out of the electoral division in which such lands are situate."—(*The Lord Ventry.*)

The Marquess of WATERFORD said, he thought it would be better that the rent should be a set-off for the rates, not in the electoral division, but in the whole Union. The noble Lord's proposal would, he feared, lead to complication. He would suggest that the matter should be dealt with on Report.

Clause (by leave of the Committee) *withdrawn.*

Lord VENTRY moved the insertion of a new clause (19D), giving the Local Government Board power to order an inquiry upon the complaint of any person liable to the payment of poor rates as to any breach or non-compliance with the provisions of Section 13 of the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1883, by the Sanitary Authority; and also giving the Board power to enforce the observance of the section in question by the imposition of a penalty upon the Sanitary Authority.

Moved, to add, in page 10, after Clause (C), the following new Clause:—

"When complaint is made to the Local Government Board by any person liable to the payment of poors rates in any sanitary district of any breach of or non-compliance with any of the provisions of section thirteen of the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1883, by the Sanitary Authority, the Local Government Board may direct a local inquiry to be held, and if such breach or non-compliance shall be proved at such local inquiry, the Local Government

Board may make such order with respect to such breach or non-compliance and for prohibiting the continuance thereof as to the said Board shall seem fit, and may enforce the observance of the same by the imposition of a penalty upon the sanitary authority not exceeding pounds, and by a farther penalty not exceeding pounds for every day after the first during which such breach or non-compliance shall continue."—(*The Lord Ventry.*)

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD said, that the Local Government Board might be trusted to do its duty without any provision of this kind being inserted. He could not accept the clause.

Clause (by leave of the Committee) *withdrawn.*

LORD VENTRY moved the insertion of a new clause (19E), to prevent any person in receipt of outdoor relief occupying any of the cottages under the Act.

Moved, to add, in page 10, after Clause (D), the following new Clause:—

"It shall not be lawful for the sanitary authority to allow any person who may be in receipt of outdoor relief, other than medical relief, to continue in occupation of any cottage built or acquired under this Act, or of any land of which he may be the tenant under any of the provisions of this Act."—(*The Lord Ventry.*)

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD said, the clause was unnecessary, as the law as it stood was sufficient for the purpose. He could not, therefore, accept it.

Clause (by leave of the Committee) *withdrawn.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

Schedule *agreed to.*

The Report of the Amendments to be received on *Monday* next; and Bill to be *printed* as amended. (No. 241.)

PUBLIC HEALTH (METROPOLIS) BILL [H.L.]

A Bill to consolidate with amendments certain Acts relating to nuisances, infectious diseases, and other matters concerning public health in the Metropolis—Was *presented* by The Marquess of SALISBURY; read 1ª. (No. 240.)

House adjourned during pleasure; and resumed by the Viscount Hawarden.

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL [H.L.]

Returned from the Commons *agreed to*, with amendments; the said amendments to be *printed*; and to be considered on *Monday* next. (No. 242.)

House adjourned at a quarter before One o'clock A.M. to Monday next, a quarter past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Friday, 7th August, 1885.

MINUTES.]—RESOLUTION [August 6] *reported*—East India (Revenue Accounts).

PUBLIC BILLS — *Committee* — *Report* — *Third Reading* — County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (Pensions) [112]; Registration Appeals (Ireland) [259], and *passed.*

Considered as amended—*Third Reading*—Criminal Law Amendment [257]; Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment [258], and *passed.*

Withdrawn—Tramways Order in Council (Ireland) * [243]; Turbary (Ireland) * [146].

QUESTIONS.

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS ACT, 1876—VIVISECTION LICENCES—DR. E. E. KLEIN.

MR. FIRTH asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Dr. E. E. Klein, whose name appears in the last annual Return (for the first time) as a licensee and the holder of a certificate, under the Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876, for experiments on living animals without anæsthetics, is the person of that name who was examined before the Royal Commission of 1875, and then stated (Questions 3539, 3541, 3544) that he had no regard at all to the sufferings of animals when performing experiments without anæsthetics?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS), in reply, said, that he believed the licence was granted early in 1884, and that the gentleman was the same gentleman that was referred to in the Question.

PERU AND CHILI—THE PERUVIAN BONDHOLDERS.

MR. WILLIAMSON asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether the proposed action of Her Majesty's Government on behalf of Peruvian bondholders has been suggested to them by any Foreign Power; whether it is the case that, in commenting on its contents, in a letter to the chairman of the bondholders, dated 24th November 1884, Lord Granville expressed general satisfaction with the Note of the Chilian Government of 5th June 1884, and made citations from it which clearly pointed to the necessity for first legally establishing the claims of creditors in the tribunals of Chili; whether the present Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs has, in his letter of 28th July 1885, assumed the existence of a valid hypothecation of territory or property without its having been legally established; and, whether Her Majesty's Government will, in the circumstances, agree to reconsider the course they had proposed to take, so as to avoid disturbing friendly relations with Chili, and indirectly injuring our commerce with that country?

Sir HENRY TYLER: Before my right hon. Friend answers this Question, I should like to ask him whether he is aware that the hon. Member for St. Andrews (Mr. Williamson) is a member of the firm of Williamson, Balfour, & Co., of Valparaiso; whether he is aware of the relations of that firm to the Chilian Government with regard to contracts and other matters and to the proposed loan; and, whether he is aware that the hon. Member for St. Andrews is familiarly known as the hon. Member for Santiago, Chili?

Mr. WILLIAMSON: I must appeal to you, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of Privilege. The hon. Member for Harwich (Sir Henry Tyler) put the same Question to me, when I last year put a Question to the then Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. He put exactly the same Question, and insinuated that I, as a member of that firm in Valparaiso, had dealings and contracts with the Chilian Government. I beg, Sir, to let you and the House understand that I am a partner of that firm, and that we have never had any contracts or business relations with the Chilian Government, and that I put this Question as a matter of public interest.

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Bourke): It is not for me to reply to the Question of my hon. Friend behind me (Sir Henry Tyler).

Mr. WILLIAMSON: But, Mr. Speaker, is there not an infringement of Privilege on the part of the hon. Member opposite (Sir Henry Tyler)? Because I answered the Question last year, and he knows perfectly well——

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. Gentleman (Mr. Williamson) has put himself quite right with the House in making the statement he has made, and I do not think there is any necessity for any further notice being taken.

Sir HENRY TYLER: I shall be very happy to bring forward my authority for the statement on which my Questions are founded.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE: As regards the first part of the Question of the hon. Member (Mr. Williamson), I have to say that I do not think that I should be justified in stating, at the present time, what diplomatic communications have taken place on the subject of the joint representation made to the Chilian Government. As regards the second part, I cannot say that I assent to the interpretation placed by the hon. Member on the letter referred to. That letter merely says that—

> "Her Majesty's Government, while not conceding the soundness of all the propositions put forward in the Chilian reply, accept with satisfaction the assurance contained in it, that the position of the creditors of Peru in relation to the ceded territory, and as affected by the cession, will be equitably considered by the Chilian Government."

As regards the third part, the letter referred to contains no assumption of legal rights, but merely states facts. As regards the last part, Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that there is nothing in the course which they have taken calculated to disturb friendly relations with Chili, or to injure our commerce with that country, and that no circumstances have been shown which call for a reconsideration of the matter.

Mr. WILLIAMSON: With reference to the answer which the right hon. Gentleman has given me, I am perfectly satisfied with his reply to the second paragraph of my Question, and I hope——[*Cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: Order, order!

Mr. WILLIAMSON: I have to ask that before those representations—[*Renewed cries of* "Order!"]—are sent out to the Chilian Government—the joint representations of the Powers—["Order!"]—I have to ask whether the Government will not more fully consider this whole matter? He has admitted——[*Renewed cries of* "Order!"]

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE: I have said already that Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that there is no need for any reconsideration of the matter.

TREATY OF BERLIN—ARTICLE X.—THE VARNA-RUSTCHUK RAILWAY COMPANY.

MR. TOTTENHAM asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, If any steps have been taken to call the attention of the Bulgarian Government to the obligations imposed on that country by the 10th Article of the Treaty of Berlin, in her relations with the Varna Railway Company; if it is the case that the Bulgarian Government is now indebted to this Company in the sum of £980,000; and, whether any offer has been made to discharge this debt or any portion of it?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. BOURKE): The attention of the Bulgarian Government has been repeatedly drawn to the obligations imposed on Bulgaria by the 10th Article of the Treaty of Berlin. The Correspondence on the subject will be found in the Blue Book No. 13, of 1884, where it will be seen that the amount of the claim is disputed by the Bulgarian Government. The last offer made by Bulgaria has been rejected by the Company. Her Majesty's Government are of opinion that the best course would be to press for the reference to the Ambassadors at Constantinople, as provided for in the Treaty of Berlin, and which was agreed to by Bulgaria in 1881. Difficulties, however, of a material character have hitherto arisen as to the terms of reference under this engagement, and the matter is still in course of arrangement between the Company, the Bulgarian Government, and Her Majesty's Government.

ARMY (AUXILIARY FORCES)—THE 4TH ROYAL IRISH FUSILIERS (CAVAN MILITIA)—MAJOR LIONEL BROOKE.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Secretary of State for War, How many days has Major Lionel Brooke, of the 4th Royal Irish Fusiliers (Cavan Militia), been absent with and without leave from headquarters, between the training of 1884 and the training of 1885; and, if it is true that this Officer is in the habit of being absent without leave from Saturday to Tuesday at Brookeboro' in almost every week, and whether such absence is approved by the authorities; if Corporal Caddin, of B Company Cavan Militia, has been refused re-enrolment by Major Lionel Brooke, and on what grounds and under what section of Military Law this Non-Commissioned Officer was brought before the Bounty Board and fined 2*s*. 6*d*. at last training of his regiment; if it is the intention of the authorities to dispense with the services of Captain Somerset Maxwell, he having been absent from the training of his regiment, the Cavan Militia, during 1884 and 1885, and also absent the greater part of 1883; under what circumstances was Lieutenant Dease, of the Cavan Militia, permitted to draw Captain's pay during the last training of his regiment, he not having been at that time promoted to be Captain; and, whether this officer left Cavan without discharging in full his lodging-house account?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): Inquiries have been made on the subjects in the later paragraphs of the Question; but sufficient time has not elapsed since the Question was placed on the Order Book for replies to have been received. As regards the first paragraph, I must refer the hon. Member to my reply on the 3rd instant.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN asked if the right hon. Gentleman was not aware that Major Brooke was absent with leave?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE said, he did not know; but he had no doubt Major Brooke had authority for his absence.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—CHARGE OF INTOXICATION AGAINST THE SCHOOLMASTERS OF THE BELFAST WORKHOUSE.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What steps the Local Government Board for Ireland have taken regarding the report furnished them, about two schoolmasters of the Belfast Workhouse named Madden and M'Guinness, who were seen in a helpless state of drunkenness in the streets of Belfast on the 14th July 1885; is it true that, although Madden was assisted by some friends through a back entrance into the workhouse on this date, to the knowledge of the head schoolmaster and other officials of the workhouse, as well as several paupers, no report of Madden's condition was made to the Guardians; is it true that Madden offered a written explanation to the Guardians of his misconduct, and that the Chairman of the Board directed him to withdraw it, so that the document would not require to be entered on the minutes of their proceedings; is Madden the same person who was convicted at the Belfast Petty Sessions of drunkenness and using party expressions; and, is it desirable that schoolmasters of this class should be continued in office; and, if not, what steps will be taken in relation to these two teachers?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): No such Report as that mentioned in this Question has been furnished to the Local Government Board. I understand that anonymous letters containing a charge of this kind against these two schoolmasters have been sent to the Chairman of the Board of Guardians, and to the Local Government Board, who have both very properly declined to take notice of communications of that character.

EDUCATION (IRELAND)—INDUSTRIAL SCHOOL AT BALLAGHADARREEN, CO. MAYO.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, If he will now issue a certificate for the Industrial School for girls which the Catholic Bishop of Achonry desires to establish at Ballaghaderreen, county Mayo?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): No, Sir; the utmost I could do would be to promise that this case should be considered with others when next year's Estimates are being framed; but I feel that I would not be justified now in saying anything which would encourage the promoters of this or other schools to incur expense in anticipation of the possibility of receiving a certificate. It must be borne in mind that numerous applications of this kind are made to the Government by benevolent persons in different parts of the country, the majority of which must, of necessity, be refused.

LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) BILL.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, With reference to the forty-nine years annuity of £4, which, under the Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill, is to be the price paid to the State for £100 in land; and, whether the annuity in its entirety is under the 5 and 6 Vic. c. 35, s. 60, to be subject to the deduction of Income Tax by the debtor of the State, in which case the State would lose the amount of the Tax on the whole of its capital invested in the land, or whether, following the precedent of 16 and 17 Vic. c. 34, s. 42, it shall be made lawful for any person paying such annuity to deduct and retain thereout the Duty computed on the interest included in such annuity, and no more?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: A tenant taking advantage of the provisions of the Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill will in no case be entitled to deduct Income Tax on the annuity in its entirety; because such an annuity consists not only of interest, but also of a repayment of the principal. On so much, however, of the annuity as represents interest, the tenant will have a claim, if duly assessed, to deduct Income Tax by analogy to the 16 & 17 *Vict.*, c. 34, s. 42. The proportion which consists of interest, and which has to be retained, will have to be determined, either by legislation, as in the Irish Church Amendment Act, 35 & 36 *Vict.*, c. 90, or by Treasury authority, as in the case of loans under the Relief of Distress (Ireland) Act, 1880. The attention of the Inland Revenue Board has been called to the matter, and before any repayments under the Land Purchase Bill are made it will be determined in what way the point raised should be met.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR asked whether the same rule would be applied to all Terminable Annuities?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: No, Sir; I can only undertake to deal with this question.

THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY—MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD, who had the following Question on the Paper:—

> "To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, whether he can now state the names of the Commissioners in the Royal Commission on Trade Depression; and, whether the Memorandum will be communicated to the House before the end of the Session?"

said, he would postpone the Question till Monday, when he would ask whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer would not make a statement simultaneously with that of Lord Iddesleigh to the House of Lords?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, he thought it would be much more convenient that hon. Members should see what Lord Iddesleigh's statement was, that noble Lord having been throughout in charge of this matter; and then, of course, after that statement was made, he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) should be prepared to answer any Question that might arise out of it.

LOTTERIES ACT—FOREIGN LOTTERIES.

Mr. CLARE READ asked Mr. Attorney General, If his attention has been called to an advertisement of a Foreign lottery in *The English Labourers' Chronicle,* headed "A Fortune," in which the labourers are invited to speculate on the chance of winning prizes; whether such a publication is contrary to the Lotteries Act; and, whether, upon a re-appearance of this or similar advertisements, proceedings will be taken against the publishers and proprietors of the newspaper?

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir John Gorst) (who replied) said: In reply to my hon. Friend, I have to say that the lottery in question is contrary to the Lottery Acts, and renders the printer and publisher liable to a penalty of £50. An action to recover the penalty can only be brought with the sanction of the Attorney General or the Solicitor General. In reply to the second part of the Question, my answer is that upon the re-appearance of such advertisements, if the hon. Member or any of his friends desires to sue for these penalties, if they put themselves in communication with me I shall be happy to allow them to use my name in the action on certain conditions.

POOR LAW GUARDIANS (IRELAND) BILL.

Mr. SEXTON asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, What course the Government mean to take on the Amendment of the Lords in the Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Bill, maintaining the vote by proxy at Poor Law Elections in Ireland, and on the Amendment maintaining the strength of ex-officio members on each Board of Guardians at one-half the total number of the Board instead of one-third, the proportion adopted by this House?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes): Having regard to the late period of the Session, and the protracted discussions these Amendments are likely to give rise to, there is no hope of giving an opportunity of dealing with them. Perhaps, under the circumstances, the hon. Member having charge of the Bill will move that the Order be discharged.

Mr. SEXTON said, he would move to discharge the Order, and would give Notice that next Session he would introduce a Bill to make Boards of Guardians in Ireland entirely elective.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) BILL.

Mr. BRODRICK said, that it was proposed by the Government to take the Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill as first Order that day. How was it that it was the ninth Order on the Paper?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The simple reason is that there is no chance of dealing with the Bill at all to-night. What I said was that if the Criminal Law Amendment Bill was not finished last night it must necessarily be taken as first Order to-day, and after it the Housing of the Working Classes Bill. It would be obviously impossible, therefore, to proceed with the Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill to-night.

Colonel NOLAN: Why not proceed with it to-morrow?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: To-morrow will be Saturday, and I should be very reluctant to ask the House to meet to-morrow; but if the Criminal Law Amendment Bill is finished to-night, and the second reading of the Housing of the Working Classes Bill be taken, the Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill will be the first Order for Monday.

MR. SEXTON asked, if the Housing of the Working Classes Bill was finished at a tolerably early hour—say, by 1 o'clock—would the Government ask the House to go into Committee on the Bill, and name the two Gentlemen who are to be the Commissioners?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, in reply, said, that it would be inconvenient for the House to leave it uncertain whether they would proceed with the Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill or not that evening; but he would consult with his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary.

MR. SEXTON: Will the Commissioners be named?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: We have undertaken to give the two names before we go into Committee.

AFRICA (EAST COAST)—GERMAN ANNEXATION AT ZANZIBAR.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, he wished to ask the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs a Question of which he had given private Notice. He had received a telegram from the Manchester Chamber of Commerce, expressing great anxiety with reference to the report in *The Times* of that day, as to the annexation by Germany in the neighbourhood of Zanzibar. He wished to ask whether the right hon. Gentleman had any information to give to the House on the subject?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. BOURKE), in reply, said, if his hon. Friend had given him Notice he would have endeavoured to answer the Question. He had seen the telegram in *The Times;* but he did not think he was justified in answering without Notice. He had no information whatever with respect to this matter.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD gave Notice that he would put the Question down for Monday.

INLAND NAVIGATION AND DRAINAGE (IRELAND)—FLOODS IN COUNTY CLARE.

THE O'GORMAN MAHON asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, Whether the Irish Government are aware that great damage has been and is being caused by the overflow of swamps, and the consequent flooding of agricultural and pastoral lands in the district of Kilkee, county Clare; and, whether the Government will immediately cause the Board of Works to institute a competent inquiry, with a view to ascertain the nature and extent of the damage, and to decide whether the State can aid the occupiers of the district in executing drainage operations?

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND): No complaints on this subject appear to have been received. The Government have no legal power to take any such action as is suggested in the Question of the hon. Member until the Board of Works are put in motion by persons locally interested. If that course is taken inquiries will, no doubt, be instituted without delay.

ARMY—RAILWAYS IN WAR TIME.

SIR HENRY TYLER asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether, having reference to recent experience in the Soudan, as well as to previous cases in which Officers and men of the British Army have been required for the purpose of constructing and working Railways in time of War, he will now take into consideration the question of systematically training the Officers and men of the Royal Engineers for the construction, working, and superintendence of Railways in time of war?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): There is no doubt that recent operations in the Soudan have afforded valuable experience as to the construction and working of military railways. Two strong railway companies have been already formed in the Royal Engineers; and a Departmental Committee is now sitting which will consider, together with other subjects, the question of the employment of the Corps of Royal Engineers on railway duties.

PUBLIC HEALTH (METROPOLIS)—STATE OF THE RIVER LEA.

MR. DANIEL GRANT asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether his attention has been directed to the present unsanitary condition of the River Lea, as depicted in the columns of *The Standard;* and, having regard to the part played by that river in one of the serious outbreaks of cholera in the Metropolis, whether it is his intention to take any steps to avert the possible recurrence of the like danger?

The PRESIDENT of the BOARD (Mr. A. J. Balfour), in reply, said, that he had already answered a similar Question, the reply being to the effect that a loan for works to cure the insanitary condition of the River Lea had already been sanctioned, and, pending the completion of those works, temporary works were in progress.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) ACT—THE ASSISTANT REVISING BARRISTERS.

Mr. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he is yet in a position to name the Assistant Revising Barristers about to be appointed under the new Registration Act in Ireland?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): If the hon. Member will put this Question to me on Tuesday next I shall probably be in a position to give him the information.

ARMY—THE CLOTHING DEPARTMENT—MILITARY TEMPORARY CLERKS.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON asked the Secretary of State for War, If, while the ordinary established Civil Service clerks in the Clothing Department receive about 10*s.* a-day, it is the fact that the Military temporary clerks receive only 4*s.* a-day; and, if he would favourably consider the case of these latter with a view to ameliorating the position of these old soldiers?

The FINANCIAL SECRETARY, WAR DEPARTMENT (Mr. H. S. Northcote): Military temporary clerks receive the rates of pay laid down by the Royal Warrant. Instead of 10*s.* a-day, the temporary clerks of the lower division employed at the clothing factory receive, on the average, less than 7*s.* a-day; but the conditions of service are altogether different, and comparison cannot be made justly between the respective classes.

ARMY—LIMERICK ARMY CLOTHING FACTORY.

Mr. SEXTON (for Mr. Parnell) asked the Surveyor General of Ordnance, Whether the work executed on contract for the Army at the Limerick Army Clothing Factory costs less than similar work done at the Government Clothing Factory in Pimlico; whether the existing contracts now being executed by the Limerick Factory will be completed about the end of September, and whether, as a consequence of this and of the absence of fresh Government contracts, about a thousand hands are likely to be thrown out of employment in the city of Limerick, while the hands of the Pimlico Factory will be maintained in full work; and, whether, under these circumstances, the Department will give the Limerick Factory sufficient work to keep their hands employed during the winter months on the same terms as in the Government Factory at Pimlico?

The SURVEYOR GENERAL of ORDNANCE (Mr. Guy Dawnay): Work executed at the Limerick factory usually, but not invariably, costs less than work executed at Pimlico. In their latest contract for kersey frocks and tweed trousers, the Limerick prices exceeded in a marked manner those of Pimlico; at the rate of production which has obtained since April, it will be the end of October before the Limerick factory will have sent in all the clothing for which they have contracts. By that time it will be practicable to see to what extent further contracts can be given to Limerick; but, as regards reduction of workpeople, a large reduction will have to be made at Pimlico, and Limerick can scarcely hope to escape one also.

Mr. SEXTON: Are we to understand that, if the work can be done cheaper than at Pimlico, Limerick will not suffer?

The SURVEYOR GENERAL: Yes; Limerick will not suffer at all.

THE PARKS (METROPOLIS) — INCLOSURE AT REGENT'S PARK.

Mr. DANIEL GRANT asked the First Commissioner of Works, Whether his attention has been drawn to a statement in "*The Echo*" of Saturday last, that a portion of the land in Regent's Park, lately restored to the public, has been again inclosed; and, whether such statement is correct; and, if so, what steps he proposes to take in the matter?

The FIRST COMMISSIONER (Mr. Plunket): A portion of the land adjoining the ornamental water in the Regent's Park has been railed off, in order to lessen the risk of children being drowned by going too near the edge at a place where the bank is rather steep, and also in order to secure a resting place for the wild fowl. A similar course has been adopted in other London parks, and I quite approve of such precautions being taken; however, having carefully investigated the matter myself, I think that rather more space has been reserved for these purposes than was absolutely necessary, and I have given directions that it should be reduced, so as to leave as much of the grass to the public as possible.

POST OFFICE—REGISTRATION OF TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESSES.

Colonel KING-HARMAN asked the Postmaster General, Whether, under the Telegraph Acts Amendment Bill, any alteration would be made in the existing system of registration of addresses for telegraphic purposes?

The POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord John Manners): It is not proposed to make any alteration in the charge or the system for the registration of addresses.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE ACT, 1884—POLICE ENFRANCHISEMENT.

Mr. COLERIDGE KENNARD asked, Why a Question did not appear on the Paper that he had given Notice of as to whether the late Attorney General adhered to his statement that the House was unanimous in objecting to the clause in favour of police enfranchisement he (Mr. Coleridge Kennard) brought forward on the Representation of the People Bill, when the fact was that he withdrew it, and no division was taken?

Mr. SPEAKER said, he had the terms of the Question before him, which related to past debates in the House. Such a Question would be irregular.

Mr. COLERIDGE KENNARD, in explanation, said, the Question was in allusion to the right hon. and learned Gentleman's (Sir Henry James's) remarks on Monday.

Sir HENRY JAMES, in making a personal explanation (by leave of the Speaker), said, the hon. Member for Salisbury (Mr. Coleridge Kennard) questioned the accuracy of the statement that the House had unanimously expressed an opinion against embodying the principle of police enfranchisement in the Representation of the People Bill. Now, that statement he (Sir Henry James) adhered to and emphasized. In Committee on the Registration (Occupation Voters) Bill, on the part of the late Government, he had stated the objections to the enfranchisement of the police in answer to the Motion of the hon. Member for Salisbury that the police should be enfranchised; and while speaking the signs of assent in the Committee were so marked that he made his observations very briefly. As soon as he brought his observations to an end two hon. Members rose to their feet. The hon. and learned Member for Bridport (Mr. Warton) was successful in his claim to address the House first, and he said that he had

> "reached a state of happiness which he never expected to enjoy of being able to concur with every word uttered by the Attorney General."

The hon. Member for Salisbury then spoke, and he said that, after what had been stated in reply to his Motion, he desired to ask the leave of the House to withdraw the clause, and the House unanimously gave him leave to do so. That appeared to him (Sir Henry James) to represent a state of unanimity on the point—one much better expressed than by taking a division, under which he did not see that unanimity could have occurred; and, therefore, he felt justified in stating that the House unanimously expressed an opinion on the subject of police enfranchisement by rejecting the Motion of the hon. Member.

THE SUEZ CANAL—THE PARIS CONFERENCE.

Mr. MONK asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he will state to the House what decisions were arrived at by the Conference held at Paris in reference to the Suez Canal; and, whether any Papers on the subject will be presented to Parliament before the Prorogation?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Bourke): It would not be possible, within the limits of an answer to a Parliamentary Question, to give the information asked for by the hon. Member. But the Papers are being prepared with the utmost despatch, and will be presented before the Prorogation. No definite decision has yet been arrived at by the Conference.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

——o——

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL

[*Lords*].—[Bill 241.]

(*Secretary Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

CONSIDERATION. [ADJOURNED DEBATE.]

[SECOND NIGHT.]

Further Proceeding on Consideration, as amended, *resumed.*

Clause 1.

Mr. HOPWOOD moved an Amendment, providing that the Act should come into force on the 1st day of January, 1886.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 6, by inserting after the word "Act," the words "shall come into force on the first day of January, one thousand eight hundred and eighty-six, and."—(*Mr. Hopwood.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he saw no reason why they should not begin to punish these crimes as soon as the Bill was passed, instead of allowing them to go, as they would if he accepted the Amendment, unpunished all through the winter. He, therefore, could not accept the hon. and learned Member's proposal.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Amendments made.

Clause 2.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 12, by leaving out the word "character," and inserting the word "reputation,"—(*Mr. Warton,*)

—instead thereof.

Question, "That the word 'character' stand part of the Bill," put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 17, by inserting after the word "prostitute," the words "or of known immoral character."—(*Mr. Tomlinson.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *negatived.*

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross), in moving, as an Amendment, in page 1, line 18, to leave out from "procure" to "intent," in line 23, both inclusive, and to insert—

"(3) Procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to leave the United Kingdom, with intent that she may, for the purposes of prostitution, become an inmate of a brothel elsewhere; or (4) procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to leave her usual place of abode in the United Kingdom (such place not being a brothel) with intent that she may, for the purposes of prostitution, become an inmate of a brothel within or without the Queen's dominions,"

said, it was the re-casting of the clause which they had undertaken to effect when the Bill was in Committee.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 18, by leaving out from the word "procures," to the word "intent," in line 23, both inclusive, and inserting the words—

"(3.) Procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to leave the United Kingdom with intent that she may, for the purposes of prostitution, become an inmate of a brothel elsewhere; or

"(4.) Procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to leave her usual place of abode in the United Kingdom (such place not being a brothel), with intent that she may, for the purposes of prostitution, become an inmate of a brothel within or without the Queen's dominions,"—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross,*)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Mr. WARTON said, he would propose to amend the Amendment by the omission from Sub-section 3 of the words "for the purpose of prostitution." No right-minded Englishman would allow a woman or girl to be carried away even to become a servant in a brothel.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question proposed, "That the words—

'(3.) Procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to leave the United Kingdom with intent that she may, for the purposes of prostitution, become an inmate of a brothel elsewhere; or

'(4.) Procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to leave her usual place of abode in the United Kingdom (such place not being a brothel), with intent that she may, for the purposes of prostitution, become an inmate of a brothel within or without the Queen's dominions."

be there inserted."

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, in lines 2 and 3, leave out "for the purposes of prostitution."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the said proposed Amendment."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he was not at all disposed to stand by the words which the hon. and learned Member for Bridport proposed to strike out.

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he thought that the words ought to be retained as a safeguard against the clause imperilling persons to whom it was not right that it should apply.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Amendment amended accordingly.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment,

In line 3, by leaving out the word "elsewhere," and inserting the words "without the Queen's dominions,"—(*Mr. Warton,*)

—instead thereof.

Question, "That the word 'elsewhere' stand part of the said proposed Amendment," put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment,

In line 4, by inserting, after the word "woman," the words "under the age of thirty-one years."—(*Mr. Cavendish Bentinck.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *negatived.*

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, in line 5, by leaving out the words "such place."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question, "That the words 'such place' stand part of the said proposed Amendment," put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

MR. CAVENDISH BENTINCK, in moving to insert in page 1, line 26, after the word "labour," the following new paragraph:—

"Provided, That no person shall be convicted of any offence under this section upon the evidence of one witness, unless such witness be corroborated in some material particular,"

said, that in the class of offence dealt with by the section false swearing was extremely probable, and that the precedent of the Bastardy Acts should be followed in requiring the corroboration of the principal witness in some material particular. When this subject was under discussion before, his right hon. Friend the Secretary of State for the Home Department said it was unnecessary to make such a provision, as no Judge would allow a prisoner to be so convicted. The right hon. Gentleman had no sooner made that statement than the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite the late Attorney General (Sir Henry James), the hon. and learned Member for West Staffordshire (Mr. Staveley Hill), and the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) got up and gave a totally different account of the action of the Judges under the circumstances supposed. That being so, he hoped his right hon. Friend (Sir R. Assheton Cross) would accept his Amendment.

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 26, by inserting after the after word "labour," the words—"Provided, That no person shall be convicted of any offence under this section upon the evidence of one witness unless such witness be corroborated in some material particular."—(*Mr. Cavendish Bentinck.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR HENRY JAMES said, he thought it would be well, on the whole, if the House accepted the Amendment of the right hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Cavendish Bentinck). It applied only to Sub-section 2; but it included not only the doing of certain acts, but the attempt to do them, and the offence therein might be committed in conversation with a woman. It was desirable, therefore, in order to prevent false charges being made, that there should be corroboration. If a person did an overt act the corroboration could always be supplied, and it was the law in Scotland.

MR. ELTON said, he quite agreed with the right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Attorney General on the point, and hoped the Amendment would be agreed to.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, the Government had considered this matter fully, and they were prepared to accept the Amendment. While adopting every means to punish these offences, they must take care to prevent injustice being done.

SIR HENRY JAMES said, the charge might be maliciously made by an immoral woman. He would, therefore, suggest that words should be added making it clear that the corroboration had relation to the charge. He should therefore propose to add to it the words "by testimony tending to implicate the accused." The corroboration should certainly be of that character.

Amendment proposed, by adding at the end of the said proposed Amendment, the words "by testimony tending to implicate the accused."—(*Sir Henry James.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. J. LOWTHER said, he thought the words of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Taunton were rather vague, and suggested that the addition should consist simply of the words "by evidence implicating the accused."

SIR HENRY JAMES said, he would accept the Amendment of his proposed Amendment as suggested by the right hon. Gentleman (Mr. J. Lowther).

Amendment (*Sir Henry James*) to the said proposed Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed, by adding at the end of the said proposed Amendment, the words "by testimony implicating the accused."—(*Mr. J. Lowther.*)

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 3.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 2, by leaving out from the word "intimidation," to the words "any person," in line 6, inclusive, and inserting the words—"procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to have any unlawful carnal connection either within or without the Queen's Dominions;

"(2) By false pretences or false representations procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl, not being a common prostitute or of known immoral character, to have any unlawful carnal connection either within or without the Queen's Dominions,"—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

—instead thereof.

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill," put, and *negatived.*

Question proposed, "That the words,—

'procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl to have any unlawful or carnal connection either within or without the Queen's Dominions;

"(2) By false pretences or false representations procures or attempts to procure any woman or girl, not being a common prostitute or of known immoral character, to have any unlawful carnal connection either within or without the Queen's Dominions,'

be there inserted."

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, in line 1, leave out "attempts to procure."—(*Sir Eardley Wilmot.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the said proposed Amendment," put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment,

In line 1, by inserting, after the word "woman," the words "under the age of thirty-one years."—(*Mr. Cavendish Bentinck.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *negatived.*

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment,

In line 5, by inserting, after the word "woman," the words "under the age of twenty-one years."—(*Mr. Cavendish Bentinck.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, in line 4, by leaving out the words "or attempt to procure."—(*Sir Henry James.*)

Question, "That the words 'or attempt to procure' stand part of the proposed Amendment," put, and *negatived.*

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

MR. STANSFELD moved to amend the clause by providing that it should be an offence to administer, or cause to be taken for immoral purposes, by a girl, intoxicating liquors, as well as drugs, so as to stupefy or overpower her. He would point out that intoxicating liquors might be given to a girl to such an extent that she might be overpowered by it.

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 8, by inserting, after the word "any," the word "liquor."—(*Mr. Stansfeld.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'liquor' be there inserted."

Sir HENRY JAMES, in opposing the Amendment, said, that particular point had been very fully discussed in Committee, and the conclusion then arrived at was that it would be dangerous to accept the Amendment. What they must look to primarily was the intent with which the accused person acted.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 40; Noes 90: Majority 50.—(Div. List, No. 274.)

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 9, after the word "overpower," to insert the word "her."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question, "That the word 'her' be there inserted," put, and *negatived*.

Amendment made.

Mr. STANSFELD said, he had now an Amendment to propose in the clause to meet cases which were omitted from the Bill, but which he thought should be included in it. Houses of ill-fame were recruited by the importation into them of young women and servants, who did not know the real character of those places when they went to them. He, therefore, proposed to make it an offence for a person either knowingly to induce any woman or girl to become an inmate of a house of ill-fame, she not knowing it to be such a house, or to induce any woman or girl, not being a common prostitute, to enter a house of ill-fame, she not knowing it to be such a house, with intent that she should have unlawful commerce with any person.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 10, after sub-section (2), to insert the words—"Or (3) knowingly induces any woman or girl to become an inmate of a brothel, she not knowing the same to be a brothel, or induces any woman or girl not being a common prostitute to enter a brothel, she not knowing the same to be a brothel, with intent that she shall have unlawfulc arnal connection with any person."—(*Mr. Stansfeld.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he thought that the proposed Amendment was either covered by the words "false representation" already in the Bill, or that it went too far. Unless a person induced a woman by some false representation to go to a place that would tend to destroy her character that person ought not to come under the Criminal Law.

Mr. ELTON, in moving to amend the proposed Amendment by inserting after "common prostitute" the words "or person of known immoral character," said, that when a girl came to a London railway station the kidnapper did not tell her — "I will find a respectable lodging for you." The kidnapper would be more artful, and would say—"I will find a lodging for you," without saying it was "respectable." It was desirable that when a girl went to a situation or a lodging she should go to it with her eyes open.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment,

In line 3, by inserting, after the word "prostitute," the words "or person of known immoral character."—(*Mr. Elton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. JAMES STUART said, he had the strongest hope that the Government might see their way to accept this subsection. Many girls, especially servants, were taken to houses not knowing they were brothels. The Amendment endeavoured to put a stop to one of the most frequented avenues of procuration.

Question put, and *agreed to*; words *inserted* accordingly.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, that several hon. Members professed to know a great deal on the subject; but he should like to know where they obtained their information? The House was handling this matter in a very light-hearted way, and showing great ignorance of law and morals. The words used would apply to persons of either sex; and many of the women it referred to were often capable of acts of kindness towards each other and others of their sex. It might, therefore, be that, while intending an act of kindness to another person, they might be brought within the scope of the clause. He wished to know, therefore, whether the Amendment was intended to prevent a woman of the class of unfortunates from taking to her house, from motives of compassion, a sick girl or woman? No proposal was made in the case of hotels; and it appeared to him that the House was legislating in a sanctimonious, Pharisaical spirit, which it would regret when its legislation came into force.

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he wished to point out that false accusations could readily be made under the proposed sub-section. If a man took a woman "not a common prostitute or person of known immoral character" to a brothel, although she knew where she was going, she might afterwards, for the purpose of levying black mail upon him, turn round and accuse him of taking her to a place she did not know to be a brothel. He considered that nobody would be safe under the clause, unless a person provided himself with a witness beforehand to prove that he did give the required caution.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he was afraid the sub-section might be going too far. It might be made the means of false accusations by turning silence as to the nature of a house into a crime, and such a thing as a penalty on silence was unknown to the law. He thought it would be safer to confine the crime to making some false pretence, such as saying that the place was a respectable and proper one for the woman to enter. In cases where a false pretence was made they could rely on the first part of the clause. They had better content themselves with that, and not go so far as was proposed.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH said, he strongly supported the proposed sub-section, which he considered reasonable and necessary.

Amendment proposed, in line 5, by inserting, after the word "have," the word "any."—(*Mr. Warton.*)

Question, "That the word 'any' be there inserted," put, and *negatived.*

Question put, "That the words,—

'Or (3) knowingly induces any woman or girl to become an inmate of a brothel, she not knowing the same to be a brothel, or induces any woman or girl not being a common prostitute, or person of known immoral character, to enter a brothel, she not knowing the same to be a brothel, with intent that she shall have unlawful carnal connection with any person,'

be there inserted."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 49; Noes 71: Majority 22.—(Div. List, No. 275.)

Clause 4.

On the Motion of Sir R. Assheton Cross, the following Amendments made:—In page 2, line 26, after "labour," insert, as a separate paragraph—

"Any person who attempts to have unlawful carnal knowledge of any girl under the age of thirteen years shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and, being convicted thereof, shall be liable, at the discretion of the court, to be imprisoned for any term not exceeding two years, with or without hard labour;"

line 32, after "offenders," insert—

"And the said Act shall apply, so far as circumstances admit, as if the offender had been convicted in manner in that Act mentioned;"

and line 37, at end, add—

"The court may also order the offender to be detained in custody for a period of not more than seven days before he is sent to such reformatory school."

Sir HENRY JAMES moved to insert at the end of the clause a sub-section to the effect that when a girl, upon whom an offence under the Act is charged to have been committed, does not understand the nature of an oath, her evidence may be received, though not upon oath, if, in the opinion of the Court or Justices, such girl understands the duty of speaking the truth, provided that no conviction shall take place on such evidence unless it is corroborated by other testimony.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 37, at end of Clause 4, to insert the words—"Where a girl, in respect of whom an offence under this section is charged to have been committed, in the opinion of the court or justices before whom the charge is heard, does not understand the nature of an oath, her evidence may be received, though not given upon oath, if, in the opinion of such court or justices, such girl shall be possessed of sufficient intelligence to justify the reception of her evidence and understands the duty of speaking the truth: Provided, That no person shall be liable to be convicted of such offence unless the evidence of such girl implicating the accused shall be materially corroborated by other testimony."—(*Sir Henry James.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted," Mr. WHITBREAD said, he would suggest that the Amendment should be extended to "any other person who is tendered as a witness" with the same requirement of corroboration of such evidence. He contended that the evidence of a child should also be admitted on behalf of the accused person, and had placed an Amendment on the Paper to that effect. The same rule should apply to all persons giving evidence. It could not be right to admit a class of evidence on the accusation and to reject it when tendered for the defence.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, that he had opposed the right hon. and learned Gentleman the late Attorney General's Amendment in Committee on the ground that it introduced a new principle into English law. But he had had the opportunity of consulting the right hon. and learned Lord Advocate upon the operation of the Scotch law, which admitted such evidence as the Amendment proposed to admit. His right hon. and learned Friend assured him that no difficulty or risk had arisen in consequence of the Scotch law, which was practically the same as that proposed in the Amendment. In those circumstances he would support the Amendment; but he was inclined to think that the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bedford (Mr. Whitbread) was preferable, because, if the evidence of a child was to be taken as against the accused, he saw no reason why, in fairness, a child equally young should not be allowed to be called as a witness for the accused.

Mr. ASHER said, he also supported the Amendment of the hon. Member for Bedford (Mr. Whitbread). He had intended to vote against that of his right hon. and learned Friend the Member for Taunton (Sir Henry James); and even if it had been carried he should have been prepared to move that it should not apply to Scotland, because it would undoubtedly restrict, rather than extend, the effect of the existing Law of Evidence in that country. He had had for many years practical experience of the working of the system in Scotland; and he was bound to say, as the result of his own experience, that the evidence of young children was a most material and valuable aid in a great number of cases to the ascertainment of the truth; and that, he believed, was the opinion of lawyers in Scotland generally.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, he thought it would be better for the right hon. and learned Gentleman (Sir Henry James) to withdraw his Amendment, and let the hon. Member for Bedford's Amendment be moved as a substantive one.

Mr. EDWARD CLARKE said, he should support the original Amendment, and oppose the extension of it suggested by the hon. Member for Bedford (Mr. Whitbread). He could not help thinking that to allow a child other than the complainant to give evidence otherwise than upon oath would be a source of serious danger to the accused.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, he thought the feeling of hon. Members was rather in favour of the proposal of his hon. Friend (Mr. Whitbread); and he would withdraw his sub-section in favour of that of his hon. Friend, which, however, he should propose to amend by adding a Proviso at the end.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 37, at end, to insert the words—"Where, upon the hearing of a charge under this section, the girl in respect of whom the offence is charged to have been committed, or any other person who is tendered as a witness, does not, in the opinion of the court or justices, understand the nature of an oath, the evidence of such girl or other person may be received, though not given upon oath, if, in the opinion of the court or justices, as the case may be, such girl or other person is possessed of sufficient intelligence to justify the reception of the evidence."—(*Mr. Whitbread.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

On the Motion of Sir Henry James, the following Amendment made to the said proposed Amendment:—

"Provided, That no person shall be liable to be convicted of the offence unless the testimony admitted by virtue of this section, and given on behalf of the prosecution, shall be corroborated by some other material evidence tending to incriminate the accused."

Amendment, as amended, further amended, and *agreed to.*

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH, in moving to add words at the end of the Amendment to enable the statement of a child of tender years made by her before the committing magistrate, and taken down in writing at the time, to be used at the trial, said, the reason that he proposed this further Amendment was that frequently a little child might lose its memory of the facts before the trial came on.

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the foregoing Amendment, to add the words "and the court may, for the same purpose, allow a similar statement made by her before the committing justice or magistrate, and taken down in writing at the time, to be used for the same purpose at the trial."—(*Mr. Samuel Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he regarded this further Amendment as being most dangerous. In the case of a false charge being brought, it would be most unfair to the accused that the statement should be received without the child being produced and cross-examined. In such a case no man would be safe, and would be at the mercy of any person who chose to coach up a child to give evidence in support of a false charge.

Mr. GREGORY said, he also thought that the Amendment might have very dangerous consequences. In considering the Bill they had to guard as much against conspiracies being brought against innocent men as against the offence sought to be a stop to.

Mr. BROADHURST said, he thought that the Amendment should not be rejected without fair consideration. After a few months the facts would fade away from the child's memory like a dream, although, at first, her statement might bear the impress of truthfulness. Of course, it would be necessary that the statement should be corroborated.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he had always understood that it was better that several guilty persons should escape than that one innocent person should be convicted; and it appeared to him that, if this Amendment were to be carried, the danger of convicting innocent persons would be largely increased. The Scotch law contained no provision of this kind.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, that if he had had any idea that this rider was to be added to it he would have had no hand in framing the clause. He would remind the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. S. Smith) that the examination of the child before the committing magistrate might not take place until months after the charge was brought.

Mr. EDWARD CLARKE said, he should vote against the whole clause if this fantastic addition were made to it.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Mr. HOPWOOD, in moving an Amendment to the effect that a witness whose testimony had been received without oath should be liable to indictment and punishment for perjury in all respects as if he or she had been sworn, pointed out that an indictment for perjury was the only Court of Appeal open to a man who had been wrongfully convicted of charges of this nature.

Amendment proposed to Sir Henry James's Amendment, as amended, at end, add—

"Provided also, That any witness shall be liable to indictment and punishment for perjury in all respects as if she had been sworn." —(*Mr. Hopwood.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Sir HENRY JAMES said that, as far as he was concerned, he should be glad to see the words added—not that it was desired to punish the child, but in order that the accused should have every opportunity of establishing his innocence. He would, however, prefer to amend the Amendment, so as to make it run as follows:—"Any witness whose evidence has been admitted under this section shall be liable," &c.

Amendment proposed to said proposed Amendment, in line 1, after "witness," insert the words "whose evidence has been admitted under this section."—(*Sir Henry James.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

Mr. BROADHURST, in moving the following Proviso:—

"Provided on the trial of any person whose age does not exceed sixteen years, if it is proved in evidence that he has, through inability to procure better accommodation, habitually slept in the same room with other persons of both sexes, the court before passing sentence shall take such circumstances into consideration,"

said, he wished the House thoroughly to understand the importance of the proposal he was then making, and would, therefore, ask hon. Members to study it well while he was speaking in support of it. If there was overcrowding in our large cities, society and the

State were responsible for it to a larger extent than the poor victims of the crime. Therefore, he would appeal to the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Assheton Cross) to give as favourable consideration to the provision as possible; for he could not imagine that the members of families brought up under the conditions in which thousands of families in this country were, unfortunately, born and brought up for the greater part of their lives could really be expected to possess as high a code of morality as children brought up in the well-to-do houses of well-to-do parents. He had no hesitation in saying that if the Bill passed without some Proviso of this kind a great and grave injustice, if not a crime, would have been inflicted upon the poorer classes of society. The evils of overcrowding were fresh in the minds of the public, especially to those Members of the House who served on the recent Royal Commission; and it was amazing to him, considering the circumstances in which the poor lived, that morality amongst them was so high as it was. The truth was that large numbers of persons belonged to a class of society plunged in misery and pressed by starvation, and that they could not place themselves under any better conditions. He hoped the House would assent to the introduction of the Amendment; for though some Judges might, without it, consider these palliating circumstances, others might not.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, at end of Clause 4, to add—"Provided on the trial of any person whose age does not exceed sixteen years, if it is proved in evidence that he has, through inability to procure better accommodation, habitually slept in the same room with other persons of both sexes, the court before passing sentence shall take such circumstances into consideration."—(*Mr. Broadhurst.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Sir WILLIAM HARCOURT said, he perfectly recognized the feelings which had prompted the hon. Member (Mr. Broadhurst) in making this proposal; but he was sorry to say he could not support the Amendment, and thus make a different law for the rich and for the poor. It appeared to be a shallow and popular idea among many persons out-of-doors that the Bill would chiefly affect the rich and the profligate seducer of the poor man's child; and it was upon that assumption that an agitation had been got up, and much inflammatory language had been used. That was, however, a mistake. It was the poorer and humbler class that would be affected by the Bill; and he had no hesitation in saying that for one case in which a rich man would be affected there would be thousands, and, he might say, tens of thousands, of cases in which the poorer classes would. At the same time, there was no doubt that the evil of overcrowding was the direct cause of many of the results they all deplored. Still, while sympathizing with the important observations of the hon. Member, they could not decide that the Bill should apply to the rich, and not to the poor; that was a distinction which they could not draw, and he saw no means of making any safeguard of the kind suggested. He, therefore, opposed the proposal of the hon. Member, on the ground that its insertion would make a distinction between classes, and this would infallibly ruin the usefulness of the measure. The greater part of the seductions of poor men's children took place in their own homes and in their own neighbourhood, for many of them were brought up without any conception of purity.

Mr. WHITBREAD, in supporting the Amendment, said, he believed there could be no doubt that the Court would take into consideration circumstances such as had been referred to by the hon. Member for Stoke. He should be glad to see it inserted in the Bill, if only as a protest against overcrowding, and as a public acknowledgment that so long as the present conditions continued, under which the working classes as regarded their dwellings existed, immorality must ensue, and such scenes could not be avoided. He thought it would be well to insert the clause, as some Judges might otherwise not consider the circumstances in mitigation of punishment.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH said, he thought the House would do well to accept the Amendment of the hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Broadhurst). One of the main causes for the introduction of the Bill was the deep sense of injustice done by rich debauchees to the daughters of the poor.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he entirely endorsed what had been stated by the hon. Member for Stoke with reference to the wretched condition of the surroundings in which the children of the poor in London and other large towns were brought up; and he hoped that before many hours were over the House would be able to advance a Bill whose object was to take a small step in the direction of ameliorating this state of things. He also recognized, and it was a matter of surprise to him, in the course of the inquiry held by the Royal Commission into the Housing of the Working Classes, to find the high standard of morality which prevailed among the population of the poorest parts of London. While recognizing that there was a great deal of misery and the existence of certain moral offences peculiar to an overcrowded population, he did not see what could be done in the matter. He had had conversations with the hon. Member (Mr. Broadhurst) on this point, and it was a matter which he himself had considered with great care. They had to consider, however, the manner in which such a clause as this would work. Take the case of a boy brought up by bad parents amid the worst surroundings. He committed a theft; why? Because he had been brought up to look upon the commission of such an offence as an ordinary occurrence, and in carrying out which he committed no infraction of the law. The same consideration held good with regard to offences of violence, and the fact was that the sins of the fathers were visited on the children. They must begin, as well as they could, by improving the education of the children, with the object of bringing about an improvement in their morals. While he would have been anxious to recognize mitigating circumstances in the Bill, he thought it would be better to leave such matters to the Judge. If he thought there were any Judges who would not receive evidence on this point, and would not consider a condition of overcrowding as a circumstance to be weighed in passing sentence, he would not oppose the Amendment. But he had had some experience as to the motives which weighed with the Judges of the land in passing sentences, and he was convinced that they would take into consideration all mitigating circumstances which could be produced in evidence regarding the commission of these offences, and he was therefore convinced that the clause was unnecessary.

Mr. WOODALL, in supporting the Amendment, trusted that the last word had not been heard with regard to this proposal. He hoped his hon. Friend (Mr. Broadhurst) would take a division on his Amendment, and thus enter a protest which might not be without its effect in the administration of the law.

Mr. WILLIS, in supporting the insertion of the Amendment, said, that in the case referred to by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir R. Assheton Cross) the young lad was really not responsible at all, as what he did was the result of the evil circumstances in which he was born and in which he lived.

Mr. TOMLINSON wished to remind hon. Members that the primary object of this Bill was the protection of women and girls, and that the clause now under consideration dealt with the punishment of odious crimes. Parliament was surely not going to stultify itself by withdrawing the protection intended to be given on the ground of the unfavourable conditions under which the perpetrator of the crime might have lived.

Mr. JAMES STUART said, he felt a certain amount of difficulty in looking at an offence as excusable under any circumstances; but, on the other hand, he recognized that they were taking a step just now for the protection of the daughters of the poor, and he did not wish to shut his eyes to the circumstances under which the poor lived. He was prepared, therefore, to support the Amendment as an addendum to the clause. There could be no doubt that the miserable condition of the housing of the poor was the great cause of this evil; but he must say that the amount of guilt was also very unequal between the rich and the poor in this matter. When a man, fully educated, well instructed, and comfortably brought up, preyed upon little girls of the poor, he considered him an offender of a different character from the men who were indicated in this discussion, and whose offence they were endeavouring to extenuate in some degree by such a clause as this.

Mr. HOPWOOD, in opposing the Amendment, said, that, if adopted, it would, as standing by itself, make the Judges think that the circumstances of it were the only circumstances present to the minds of the Legislature, shutting out all others, and making that the sole case in which the House declared that mitigating circumstances should be taken into account by the Court, and would tend to disturb the balance of justice as between one class and another; for it would not apply equally to the sons of rich persons who were misled, as well as to the sons of the poor. He thought that in all cases the Judge should take into account whatever mitigating circumstances might arise in the case before him, therefore it was far better left to him.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 20; Noes 63: Majority 43.—(Div. List, No. 276.)

Amendment proposed, to add, at end of Clause, the following Proviso:—

"Whereas doubts have been entertained whether a man who induces a married woman to permit him to have connection with her by personating her husband is or is not guilty of rape, it is hereby enacted and declared that every such offender shall be deemed to be guilty of rape."—(*Mr. Thomasson.*)

Mr. HOPWOOD said, he protested against this clumsy and haphazard mode of reforming the law, which, he maintained, was discreditable to their intelligence.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he had no objection to offer to the Amendment.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. WARTON, in whose name several subsequent Amendments stood on the Paper, said that, after the extraordinary action of the Government in accepting the Amendment of the hon. Member opposite (Mr. Thomasson), with regard to a clause with which it had nothing whatever to do, he (Mr. Warton) would move no further Amendments.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 5.

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 3, after the word "labour," to insert the words—"Provided, That in the case of an offender whose age does not exceed sixteen years, the court may, instead of sentencing him to any term of imprisonment, order him to be whipped, as prescribed by the Act of the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth Victoria, chapter eighteen, intituled an 'Act to amend the Law as to the whipping of Juvenile and other Offenders,' and the said Act shall apply, so far as circumstances admit, as if the offender had been convicted in manner in the said Act mentioned; and if, having regard to his age and all the circumstances of the case, it should appear expedient, the court may, in addition to the sentence of whipping, order him to be sent to a certified reformatory school, and to be there detained for a period of not less than two years and not more than five years.

"The court may also order the offender to be detained in custody for a period of not more than seven days before he is sent to such reformatory school."—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir ALEXANDER GORDON said, he feared that detention in a reformatory might utterly ruin young men who chanced to make a mistake.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, he objected to the Amendment.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, that as the Amendment was objected to he had no wish to press it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. Serjeant SIMON, in moving an Amendment to leave out the Proviso, which stated that it should be a sufficient defence if the person charged reasonably believed the girl to have been above the age of 16, said, that by such a Proviso they were legalizing a breach of the law, and giving express encouragement to immorality. It was saying to a person who took his chance of breaking the law or not—"We will protect you in case it should turn out that you have broken the law." There was no instance of such a provision in any other case of the kind where age was a material fact.

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 10, by leaving out the words "Provided, That it shall be a sufficient defence to any charge under sub-section one of this section, if it shall be made to appear to the court or jury before whom the charge shall be brought, that the person so charged had reasonable cause to believe that the girl was of or above the age of sixteen years."—(*Mr. Serjeant Simon.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he could not assent to the Amendment. It would be most dangerous to pass the clause without the Proviso.

MR. JAMES STUART said, he was in entire agreement with the hon. and learned Member for Dewsbury (Mr. Serjeant Simon).

Question put, and *agreed to.*

SIR ALEXANDER GORDON (for Mr. MORGAN LLOYD), in moving, as an Amendment, in page 3, after "years," to insert—

> "Or that the girl at the time of the commission of the alleged offence was a prostitute,"

said, that the girl might be the greater offender of the two.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) in opposing the Amendment, said, the ground of the Bill was that the girl was to be protected. The House had raised the age from 13 to 16, and the meaning of that was that a girl of 16 should be protected in the same way as it was before proposed to protect a girl of 13.

MR. HOPWOOD supported the Amendment.

SIR WILLIAM HARCOURT said, that the House and the country would understand that, if they inserted the age of 16 in the Bill, not only would girls under that age be prevented from pursuing the trade of prostitution, but they would also be prevented from pursuing other trades. No man who had young sons would ever employ in his house any girl under 16. They ought to understand the bearing and operation of the Bill.

MR. GREGORY said, he should not regret if the operation of the Bill had the effect indicated by the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Sir William Harcourt), because he believed that girls were sent into service very much too early.

MR. M'COAN said, that the object of the promoters of the Bill was to protect young girls who were chaste, and he thought a distinction should be drawn in this connection between prostitutes and chaste girls.

MR. STANSFELD said, that the remark of his right hon. Friend (Sir William Harcourt) would apply to the age of 15 as much as to the age of 16. It was not simply because girls between 13 and 16 years of age could not, in every case, protect themselves, that they wanted to do what they were doing today. What they contended was, that it was against the interests of morality, against the interests of society, and against the interests of the State, that juvenile immorality and prostitutiom should exist. He, and those who thought with him, were prepared in their minds to go a step further, and say that a girl of such years should not be entitled to consent.

MR. TOMLINSON, in supporting the Amendment, said, that if it was not adopted some provision ought to be inserted in the Bill with the object of clearing the streets of juvenile prostitutes, and sending such girls under the age of 16 to industrial schools or reformatories.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he was given to understand by the police authorities that, if the Contagious Diseases Acts were properly worked, there would not be a girl under the age of 16 on the streets.

MR. JAMES STUART, in objecting to the Amendment, said that, if adopted, it would have the effect of invalidating the Bill in one of its essential features, by giving a legal sanction to juvenile prostitution, which it was one of the objects of the measure to repress. In that event the Bill would not deal with juvenile prostitution at all. If the evil had been reduced by the Acts referred to, it had been reduced by immoral means; if it were checked by this clause, it would be checked by moral means. Those iniquitous Acts would be repealed by the wave of public opinion, which insisted on dealing with the beginning of the evil rather than with the outcome of it. The law should deprive these children of their means of living, and society should, at the same time, come to their rescue.

MR. STOREY said, he must warn the House against striking a serious blow at the objects nearly every hon. Member had in view by passing clauses which, by their very stringency, would make the measure stink in the nostrils of reasonable men. He believed that the danger in the way of rendering legislation of this kind unsuccessful arose from the enacting of too stringent provisions.

Captain AYLMER said, that the clause, as it stood, would operate unequally in the case of two men committing the same moral offence, if one girl was under age and another not.

Mr. PICTON urged that the Amendment was absolutely inconsistent with the main objects of the Bill.

Mr. VILLIERS STUART said, that if this Amendment were accepted it would have the effect of giving a kind of legal sanction to juvenile prostitution, and defeat one of the primary purposes of the Bill.

Amendment amended, by inserting the word "common," before the word "prostitute."

Question put, "That the words 'or that the girl was at the time of the commission of the alleged offence a common prostitute,' be there inserted."

The House *divided*:—Ayes 11; Noes 82: Majority 71.—(Div. List, No. 277.)

Mr. HOPWOOD moved, as an Amendment, that it should be a sufficient defence to a charge against a defendant under 18 that the girl was, in point of fact, the more guilty of the two,

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 14, at end of Clause 5, to insert the words—"Provided also, That it shall be a sufficient defence if on the trial of a defendant under the age of eighteen years it shall be made to appear to the court or jury that the girl was, in point of fact, the more guilty of the two in the commission of the offence."—(*Mr. Hopwood.*)

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Stuart-Wortley), in opposing the Amendment on the part of the Government, said, it was against the whole policy of the Act. The clause was practically one of the most important in the Bill, and without it it would in many cases be a failure.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Amendment proposed, to add, at end of Clause the following words:—

"No prosecution shall commence for an offence under sub-section (1) of this clause more than three months after the commission of the offence."—(*Mr. Lyulph Stanley.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he would accept the Amendment.

Mr. STANSFELD said, he thought the matter ought to be left to the ordinary law. He saw no reason for an exceptional provision of this kind.

Mr. HOPWOOD supported the Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *added* accordingly.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Mr. INCE, in moving to omit in page 4, line 32, the words "in any place within the jurisdiction of such justice," said, the section related to the power of search; and the object of his Amendment, taken in connection with the next Amendment which stood in his name, was to place the law with regard to search in the case of offences under this Bill on the same footing as in cases of ordinary larceny. As the clause stood at present, the search warrant must be obtained from a Justice who had jurisdiction in the place where the girl or woman was suspected of being detained. If his two Amendments were agreed to, the search warrant might be granted by any Justice whatever.

Amendment proposed,

In page 4, line 32, by leaving out the words "in any place within the jurisdiction of such justice."—(*Mr. Ince.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

Sir HENRY JAMES said, he thought it would be dangerous to confer such a wide jurisdiction upon any Justice of the Peace, and, therefore, opposed the Amendment. It would practically give a Justice of the Peace jurisdiction over the whole of England. Beyond that it involved a considerable change of principle, and with Justices of peculiar views might be productive of considerable inconvenience, by leading to the searching of a great many houses.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he was also opposed to such a sweeping alteration of the jurisdiction of Justices of the Peace. He did not think it would be prudent to give any Justice of the Peace, having peculiar views, the power to issue any number of search warrants to search any number of places.

Mr. THOROLD ROGERS said, he was of opinion that, judging by a recent case, great delay in the execution of justice might arise unless the proposed power were given. He would call the attention of hon. Members to the case of a woman who had applied to a magistrate the other day for assistance to enable her to regain possession of her step-daughter, alleged to have been spirited away by a "wicked Baronet," and who was informed by the magistrate that he had no jurisdiction. This distribution of jurisdiction was calculated to delay justice.

Mr. HOPWOOD pointed out that the proposed change in the law was not needed, and could not be effected without breaking down our whole magisterial system. All the magistrates in the Metropolis had jurisdiction throughout the county; but, for convenience, to each was allotted a district.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. JAMES STUART, in moving, as an Amendment, in page 5, line 20, after the word "police," to insert—

> "Who shall be accompanied by the parent, relative, guardian, or other person making the information, if such person so desire, unless the justice shall otherwise direct,"

said, his motive for doing so was that he had no confidence whatever in the police in their search of immoral houses, where plenty of money was going. In saying that he had no intention of casting any reflection upon them as a body; but he thought they should not be exposed to the temptations which the circumstances would bring about, and which would be such that no reasonable body of men, however praiseworthy, could be expected to resist. The Bill was simply an instalment in the right direction; and he apprehended that, in the course of a few years, the whole question would be again under the review of the House.

Amendment proposed,

> In page 5, line 20, after "police," insert "who shall be accompanied by the parent, relative, or guardian, or other person making the information, if such person so desire, unless the justice shall otherwise direct."—(*Mr. James Stuart.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Sir HENRY JAMES, in urging the Government to accept the Amendment, said, he thought it would be most useful that someone should accompany the police to identify the person. He was very sorry to hear the suggestion of the hon. Member for Hackney (Mr. James Stuart) that they were likely soon to have this question again before them.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said that, as a matter of fact, the police always took some person with them to identify the person sought for, otherwise there would be no use in their going to a house. The addition, therefore, made such a little difference in the actual practice that he had no objection to accept the Amendment. After giving the police enormous powers, discredit should not be thrown on them.

Question put, and *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingly.

Mr. Serjeant SIMON moved to add at the end of the 9th clause the following sub-section:—

> "In the absence of a justice of the peace, or if it should be found impossible to go before a justice of the peace, a superintendent or inspector of police, or other officer in charge of a police station, shall receive information on oath as in this Clause mentioned, and shall take down such information in writing, and shall act upon such information in all respects as if a warrant had been issued as aforesaid, and any person making any false information in the matter herein mentioned shall be guilty of perjury, and dealt with and prosecuted accordingly."

The hon. and learned Member said that the object of the clause was to prevent delay in the execution of the warrant. If a felony were committed, a police officer would have the right to enter a house without a warrant; and he proposed to give him the same right in order to prevent the commission of a crime which was even greater than an ordinary felony. It might be said that in all the important towns a Justice of the Peace was easily to be found; but he held in his hand a letter—the authority of the writer of which could not be doubted—mentioning the fact that in a town with which he was connected—a town containing 17,000 inhabitants, in a mining district where, he was sorry to say, the population were of a rough and dissolute character, and where crimes of this kind were frequently committed—there was not a single magistrate resident within it. Then, again, hon. Members would be fully aware that in many of the populous districts of the North of England they might travel for miles through a succession of small towns and villages without being able to find a single resident magistrate. It was among such populations as this that the offence which they desired to put down was committed, and was likely to prevail. The object of the Amendment was to secure expedition where expedition was of the most vital importance. While "the parent or guardian or other person interested in the girl" was endeavouring to find a magistrate, and was going from one place to another in order to procure the formality of a warrant, the mischief might be done which it was the object of the Bill to prevent. He proposed that in the absence of a Justice the Superintendent or Inspector of Police should have power to receive a deposition on oath and in writing which would subject any person who set the law in motion, and who made a false deposition, to the penalties of perjury. The subject had been raised when the Bill was in Committee; but the House did not accept the Amendment. He hoped that hon. Members would now feel inclined to reconsider the matter, and deal with it in the way which he proposed. He believed that the clause would be utterly without value unless it had some addition of this kind to it. No doubt it might not be a matter of difficulty to find a magistrate in London, although it would at particular times of the year; but it must be remembered that these offences took place generally at night, at hours when a police magistrate was not sitting in Court, and was not easily to be found. He might live out of town, and in other respects not easily accessible. Under these circumstances, it appeared to him that such an addition to the clause was absolutely necessary in order that the Bill might be rendered really effectual; and he hoped the House would allow the Amendment to pass.

Amendment proposed,

In page 5, at end, to add the words—"In the absence of a justice of the peace, or if it should be found impossible to go before a justice of the peace, a superintendent or inspector of police, or other officer in charge of a police station, shall receive information on oath as in this Clause mentioned, and shall take down such information in writing, and shall act upon such information in all respects as if a warrant had been issued as aforesaid, and any person making any false information in the matter herein mentioned shall be guilty of perjury, and dealt with and prosecuted accordingly." — (*Mr. Serjeant Simon.*)

Mr. Serjeant Simon

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he objected very much to this clause, on account of the enormous powers it would give to the police. It would give an Inspector of Police the power to permit another person to break open the doors of any house in London at any hour of the night in order to make a search for some person or other in regard to whom there was a suspicion that something wrong was going on. He was bound to say that it was not desirable to give such a power. As to the difficulty of finding magistrates, he had been in communication with the Chief Magistrate in London since the Bill was in Committee, and it had been arranged that the names and addresses of all the magistrates should be scheduled and published, so that those gentlemen might easily be found when required. Any person desirous of obtaining a warrant would know where to find a magistrate, and would readily secure what he desired. He thought that would be quite sufficient, without giving these very large powers to the police.

MR. PICTON said, that the real grievance which was felt in regard to this subject was that it was much easier to recover stolen goods than it was to recover a stolen child. If hon. Members learned in the law would assure the House that that was not the case, but that it was just as easy to recover a little child seven or eight years of age who happened to have been stolen from her parents as it was to recover a set of silver spoons, undoubtedly a considerable amount of the objection entertained to the clause in its present shape would be met. But, certainly, as it stood in the Bill at the present moment it assumed that form. If a man lost his silver spoons he could get a warrant without the formality of going before a police magistrate, and could get a police officer to go with him and search the premises where the stolen property was supposed to be concealed. But if a man had a little daughter of seven or eight years of age who had been stolen, and was detained for immoral purposes, the parent could do nothing of the kind; and if a magistrate did not happen to be at hand at the moment it would be impossible for him to obtain a search warrant, and, in the meantime, the injury might be committed. He thought that it was only right for Parliament to remedy so great a grievance, and with that view he supported the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member.

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH also supported the Amendment. He thought the Government were bound to find out some other way to enable a parent, who had a child stolen at night, to get that child restored to him without the delay, and possibly the danger, which might result from being compelled, in the first instance, to obtain a search warrant from a Justice of the Peace. If the Government could point out any other way by which a child so taken away could be restored his objection to the clause, as it stood, would be removed; but if they could not suggest any easier way to secure the recovery of the child, he thought the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member ought to be accepted by the House as the only means which hon. Members, not connected with the Government, could think of.

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) denied that there were any greater facilities for recovering stolen goods than there would be to recover a stolen child if the clause, as it now stood, were agreed to without the suggested Amendment. If it could be shown that it was a case of a stolen child, then there was a remedy under the existing law, just the same as in the case of stolen goods. He believed that under the Explosives Act, if circumstances of great emergency could be shown, the assistance of the police could be called in; and certainly, in the case of a stolen child, he could not conceive that there would be any difficulty under the clause as it stood, but that the powers of the police would be just as large as those now possessed in regard to a search where a felony had been committed.

Question put.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 23; Noes 87: Majority 64.—(Div. List, No. 278.)

Mr. SAMUEL SMITH moved, in Clause 9, after the word "brothel," to insert—

"Or being the tenant, lessee, or occupier of any premises used for lawful business knowingly permits such premises or any part thereof to be used for purposes of prostitution."

The hon. Member said that the Amendment was of very great importance, and he hoped it would receive the careful consideration of the House. As the clause stood, it simply dealt with a place technically described as a "brothel," by means of which, as he understood the law, the most dangerous of all places would escape the operation of the clause. It was very well known that the greatest portion of the mischief was often done, not in places that were technically "brothels," but in other places which were largely used for the purposes of prostitution without coming under the description of brothels. It was well known in the City that there were a large number of places, such as coffee houses and restaurants, frequented by a certain class of people, and even, he was afraid, some shops, where every facility was afforded for the carrying on of these vile practices. It was into these places of lawful business that innocent girls were most frequently entrapped. They were brought up to the Metropolis under the pretence that situations would be found for them; they were taken to these places, and when once they got there they found themselves encompassed by temptations and surroundings that made escape almost impossible; and if the Bill was to be of any value whatever it must include in its purview all places where prostitution was knowingly carried on. He did not think that it was necessary that he should say more in support of the Amendment, and he hoped that the Government would accept it.

Amendment proposed,

In page 5, line 28, by inserting, after the word "brothel," the words "or being the tenant, lessee, or occupier of any premises used for lawful business knowingly permits such premises or any part thereof to be used for purposes of prostitution."—(*Mr. Samuel Smith.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir John Gorst) opposed the Amendment, on the ground that it would extend the operation of the clause to cases which the hon. Member could hardly have contemplated. The proposal of the hon. Member went a very great deal further than the speech which the hon. Member had delivered in that House. If it only proposed to give effect to the sentiments which the hon. Member had addressed to the House, the House would probably have been disposed to entertain it; but the words proposed to be inserted in the clause would certainly make it a criminal offence if a person should on any occasion permit any room in his house to be used for an immoral purpose. If the law were made so stringent that any person who should, on a single occasion, allow an immoral act to take place in his house be rendered amenable to a criminal charge, it would be a change in the law of a most important character. He took it, however, that such places as the hon. Member described in his Amendment would in reality be brothels, because the Amendment extended the operation of the clause to tenants, lessees, or occupiers of premises used for lawful business who might "knowingly permit such premises to be used for such purposes." If they "knowingly permitted" the premises to be used for immoral purposes, he (the Solicitor General) took it that they would be held to be brothels; and, therefore, the kind of places which the hon. Member asked them to include were already included in the Bill, and the introduction of these words would not effect what the hon. Member desired.

Mr. THOROLD ROGERS said, that it would be in the memory of hon. Members that, when this question was brought before the House in Committee upon the Bill, he was the Mover of the Amendment; and on that occasion there was, of course, as was constantly the case with regard to any attempt to improve the law, a conspiracy between the two Front Benches to defeat the proposal. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary went across the floor of the House, and he heard the right hon. Gentleman say—"Of course, you will oppose this." He could not mention the name of the Gentleman to whom the remark was addressed, because it would be against the Rules of the House. He did not know what the legal definition of a place of this kind was, and the House had not been favoured with a definition. They had now to rely upon the assertion of the Solicitor General that the Amendment proposed by his hon. Friend the Member for Liverpool (Mr. Samuel Smith) was already covered by the provisions contained in the Bill. He (Mr. Rogers) had long distrusted the assurances that were given by Gentlemen learned in the law, and there was nothing which he less trusted than an assurance that a particular Amendment of the existing law was already covered by the existing law itself. If hon. Members would believe the Law Officers of the Crown, there was hardly ever any necessity for making any amendment in the law at all. He took a totally different view of the matter. It would be a very serious thing, for instance, if a man who kept a draper's shop, and made use of a number of rooms in his house for the purpose of letting them to a woman who had the key of the door, and who admitted male visitors—it would be very awkward to charge the owner of the premises with keeping a brothel. He did not believe that anyone would ever attempt to make such a charge, and yet at present it was said that there were numerous premises of that kind which were made use of in that way. Of course, everybody knew what a place was that was generally called a "disorderly house"—one of those places where the churchwardens were called on to interpose in order to prevent immoral practices from being carried on. What they were now dealing with was a much more insidious evil. He had received a letter from a clergyman of great experience and knowledge. The writer said that "this was the most insidious and most mischievous way in which young girls were debauched." The Solicitor General informed them that this kind of mischief was already provided for by the existing law; and although it would be certainly necessary to take a division upon the Amendment, he presumed that those who were in favour of it would be defeated and have to grin and bear the consequences. Upon the heads of Her Majesty's Government those consequences must rest. It was stated that there was a great deal of severity in the Bill; but his opinion was that it contained a great deal more of hypocrisy in the way in which the repressive clauses of the Bill were proposed to be carried out.

Mr. STANSFELD said, that if he had followed the hon. and learned Solicitor General rightly, the hon. and learned Gentleman, speaking on behalf of the Government, appeared to express sympathy with the object of the Amendment, but thought that in its terms it was too vague and wide. He understood the hon. and learned Gentleman also to express an opinion that places where prostitution was habitually carried on might be brought within the clause. But the hon. and learned Gentleman went further, and asserted that such cases were already covered by the existing law, seeing that they would be regarded as brothels. Now, he (Mr. Stansfeld) did not feel satisfied that a place of this description would technically be a "brothel" under the existing law; and he thought the case might easily be met if, according to the view of the hon. and learned Solicitor General, instead of making this addition to the clause, they added after the word "brothel" the words "for purposes of habitual prostitution." He thought an Amendment of that kind would answer the purpose which his hon. Friend the Member for Liverpool (Mr. S. Smith) had in view.

MR. SAMUEL SMITH said, he was quite willing to withdraw the Amendment in favour of the words suggested by his right hon. Friend, if the Government would accept them.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, the Government had no objection to the words it was proposed to substitute.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. STANSFELD moved, after the word "brothel," to insert the words "or for the purposes of habitual prostitution."

Amendment proposed,

In page 5, line 28, after the word "brothel," to insert the words "or for the purposes of habitual prostitution."—(*Mr. Stansfeld.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, he had been somewhat surprised to hear his hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General say that the word "brothel" was covered by the words which the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. S. Smith) proposed to insert. He held it to be very questionable whether the word "brothel" would, in law, cover premises ostensibly used for another purpose, and actually used for another purpose, although occasionally used for the purpose of allowing immoral practices to be carried on. Notwithstanding the high authority of his hon. and learned Friend, he ventured to doubt whether the word "brothel" would cover, in an Act of Parliament, premises of that kind; and he was afraid that if the case were argued out in Court, the Court might decide that a brothel did not mean premises such as those which were intended to be struck at by the Amendment. At any rate, the question admitted of so much argument, and so much doubt as to whether the word "brothel" was intended to include such premises, and to prohibit them under the existing law, that the words ought to be inserted so as to place the matter beyond all doubt.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir JOHN GORST) said, he did not think there could be any objection to the insertion of the words proposed by the right hon. Member for Halifax (Mr. Stansfeld). With regard to the remarks of his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Christchurch (Mr. Horace Davey), he thought his hon. and learned Friend had omitted to look at the 2nd subsection of the clause in the Bill, which included the tenant, lessee, or occupier of premises used as a brothel, and also any part of such premises. He should have thought that if part of any premises was used for lawful purposes, and another part of the same premises was used as a brothel, the whole of the premises would be covered by the clause.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) moved—

In page 5, line 28, after the word "brothel," to insert the words, "or (3.) Being the lessor of any premises, or the agent of such lessor, lets the same or any part thereof with the knowledge that such premises or some part thereof are or is to be used as a brothel."

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

SIR HENRY JAMES asked whether the word "lessor" would be sufficient for the purpose? It might be the landlord of the premises without being the lessor. He would suggest that the words should be "lessor or landlord of any premises," and he would move an Amendment to that effect if the Home Secretary had no objection.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he was willing to accept the Amendment.

Amendment proposed, to amend the Amendment, after the word "lessor," in line 1, by adding the words "or landlord."—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Question, "That the words 'or landlord' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

SIR HENRY JAMES said, it would be necessary to add the same words after the second word "lessor."

Amendment proposed, to amend the Amendment, in line 2, by adding, after the word "lessor," the words "or landlord."—(*Sir Henry James.*)

Question, "That the words 'or landlord' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. TOMLINSON pointed out that it would also be necessary to insert, after the word "lets," the words "or let."

MR. STOREY said, that this was the only sub-section in the Bill which dealt with the owner. The landlord of any premises, or the agent of such landlord, who knowingly let the premises, or any part of them, for use as a brothel, was to be punished on conviction. What he wished to see was the inclusion of the owner, as well as the landlord and lessor. Experience in London often proved that the greatest delinquent was a person who lived at a distance in a fashionable villa, and conducted the business of a brothel-keeper through another person, who acted as his agent. The Home Secretary would do well, he thought, if he would propose some means by which they would get at the owner; and he would invite the attention both of the right hon. Gentleman and the hon. and learned Solicitor General to that point—namely, to what extent did they propose to interfere and punish the owner? They proposed to punish the owner, according to the Amendment of the Home Secretary, if he let his property with a knowledge that the premises, or some part, were or was to be used as a brothel; but he (Mr. Storey) undertook to say that they would never get a conviction in such a case. No owner let his property with a knowledge, such as could be proved, that it was going to be used as a brothel. He would give an illustration of what had really happened in an important town in the North of England. A person occupying the position of Alderman of the borough, and also Justice of the Peace, had a house which was let as a brothel. He let it for a term, but he took good care, through his agent, to collect the rent weekly. The rent commenced at the beginning of the tenancy, and because it was let as a brothel he got twice the amount of rent regularly every other Monday morning which other landlords were able to get for similar property in the same locality. If they had brought that Alderman up, as they ought to have brought him up, before his brother Justices, they would have to prove that he let the premises with the knowledge that such premises were to be used as a brothel. His answer would be—"When I let the premises I did not know they were going to be used as a brothel;" and how much further could the case be carried? He asked the Home Secretary most respectfully, but urgently, to add words which would enable the law to punish such an owner as that. There were already in the Bill, in the 2nd sub-section, the following words referring to the tenant, or lessee, or occupier:—

> "If he knowingly permits such premises or any part thereof to be used as a brothel."

He asked the Home Secretary to extend these words so as to include the owner and landlord as well as the lessee and tenant; and in order to test whether the right hon. Gentleman was prepared to do so, he would propose to amend the Amendment by inserting the words—

> "Or knowingly permits such premises to be used as a brothel."

The sub-section of the clause would then read—

> "Or being the lessor or landlord of any premises, or the agent of such lessor or landlord, lets the same, or any part thereof, with the knowledge that such premises or some part thereof are or is to be used as a brothel, or knowingly permits such premises to be used as a brothel."

People were extremely anxious in his part of the world, if the Bill was to be passed, that they should be able to get at the owner. It might be urged that if the Amendment were passed the landlord might re-let the property. But the owner could be got at in two ways—

first, by providing that the house should only be let as a respectable house, and not turned into a brothel, or otherwise that the tenancy would be voided at once, and the landlord have power to resume possession; or, if they did not make that provision, the landlord could serve a legal notice for the termination of the tenancy, and when the tenancy was determined, then, and not until then, if it were continued to be occupied as a brothel, and the landlord knowingly permitted it, he would render himself liable to be punished. He begged to move the addition of those words.

Amendment proposed, at the end of the said proposed Amendment, to add the words "or knowingly permits such premises, or any part thereof, to be used as a brothel."—(*Mr. Storey.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be added to the said proposed Amendment."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) intimated that he would accept the Amendment, with a Proviso that the landlord should have power of determining the tenancy.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir JOHN GORST) said, he entirely agreed with the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Storey). The landlord, when he let the premises, might have no opportunity of knowing that it was intended to make use of them as a brothel; but if he afterwards learned that they were so used he ought not to permit it. They could not, however, punish the landlord until he had had the power of determining the tenancy; and an hon. and learned Friend behind him was endeavouring to draw up some words which would meet that point—some words of this kind—

"Knowingly permits such premises to be used as a brothel after he has had the power of resuming the premises."

MR. GREGORY said, there would be enormous difficulty in proving what the tenant was. Very often a charge of this nature would fail, and sometimes the person who made it would render himself liable to prosecution.

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir JOHN GORST) thought the House had some right to complain that it was asked to treat as a crime a state of circumstances covered by an Amendment which had not been printed on the Notice Paper. He strongly protested against the continuance of a practice of that kind. He would, however, in this case suggest words which seemed to him to carry out all that the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Storey) desired. The words he would suggest were these—

"Or is wilfully a party to the continued use of such premises, or any part thereof, as a brothel."

It would then be necessary to prove that the landlord was a party to the continued use of the premises for immoral purposes, and he thought that would meet everything which the hon. Member desired.

MR. SPEAKER asked whether the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Storey) withdrew his Amendment?

MR. HOPWOOD said, he should like to know, before the Amendment was withdrawn, what the Government meant? Did they mean to drive out every one of the inhabitants from these places, or what was their policy? Was it their object to provide more decent houses and more decent rooms with the intention of debauching more of the population? He did not understand his hon. Friend to advocate strong measures. He presumed that his hon. Friend had in his eye some disorderly place which was a source of annoyance and inconvenience to the neighbourhood. He wanted to know from the Government what their policy in the matter really was, or whether their anxiety to deal with these questions was pure hypocrisy? Were these wretched people to be driven from pillar to post, and to be hunted out, rendered fugitives, and to have black mail levied upon them wherever they went? Was it proposed to imitate the course which had been pursued in Edinburgh and Glasgow, where the authorities had no mercy, but drove all these people out by having recourse to the most extreme measures; sending them out, in all their wickedness and sin, upon their neighbours until they could find, in the course of time, some surreptitious mode of returning back? He did hope hon. Members would bear in mind the nature of the case they were dealing with, and see whether they could not moderate their extraordinary rage for securing an impossible virtue.

Mr. BUCHANAN said, he did not rise for the purpose of replying to the charge which his hon. and learned Friend had brought against the authorities of Edinburgh, but for an entirely different purpose. He thought the Government might lessen the evil by framing the Amendment in a different way. The hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Storey) desired to reach the owner as well as the lessor of the premises; but in very few cases would the owner or lessor allow the premises to be taken as a brothel. As the clause now stood the first two sub-sections were practically the same, and were directed against any person who kept or managed, or acted, or assisted in the management of a brothel, or who, being the tenant, lessor, or occupier of any premises, knowingly permitted such premises, or any part thereof, to be used as a brothel. These two sub-sections were practically taken from the Edinburgh Local Act. But the remainder of the clause was different, and he would explain how they attempted to deal with the owner or lessor. Upon a first conviction, any person against whom such an offence was proved was liable to a money penalty, or, in the discretion of the Court, to imprisonment for any term not exceeding two months, with or without hard labour, with an increased pecuniary penalty; or three months on a second or subsequent conviction. Then, in case of a third or subsequent conviction the offender, in addition to the penalty or imprisonment, might be required to enter into recognizances to the amount of £50 that the house should not for six months be used for a similar purpose; and if he failed to find such security power was given to the Local Authority to shut up the house for a period not exceeding six months. In that way they secured a remedy for the undoubted evil which had been pointed out by the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Storey), and were able to get eventually at the owner or lessor, besides providing effectually for the cessation of the nuisance. He suggested to the Government that that was a better way of dealing with the evil than that which was proposed by the Solicitor General.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK said, he would like to address a question to Her Majesty's Government. He wished to ask, as the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) had asked, what the policy of the Government really was? Was it intended that a house where a woman lived by herself and received visits was to be designated a brothel, and that the owner of that house was to be subjected to the penalties proposed by the clause? He had asked a similar question when the Bill was passing through Committee — namely, why, if they were anxious that all houses called "brothels" should be put down, they were also desirous of closing houses where a prostitute happened to live by herself and received visitors? He was of opinion that houses of that kind ought not to be prosecuted, and ought not to be treated as brothels. He trusted that some Member of Her Majesty's Government would consider that question and give an answer to it. Some explanation would certainly afford satisfaction to those who wished to see the question settled in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. STOREY intimated that he would accept the words of the hon. and learned Solicitor General, and would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed,

At the end of the said proposed Amendment, to add the words—"Or is wilfully a party to the continued use of such premises, or any part thereof, as a brothel."—(*Mr. Solicitor General.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Sir HENRY JAMES contended that the words proposed by the Solicitor General did not carry the matter one whit further than the words of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Storey), nor could the landlord be wilfully a party to the use of the premises as a brothel.

Mr. STOREY asked what was the Question before the House?

Mr. SPEAKER said, the Question was to insert the words—

"Or is wilfully a party to the continuous use of such premises, or any part thereof, as a brothel."

Sir HENRY JAMES said, that anyone might write a letter to a landlord and say that his premises were being used as a brothel; but he might not become wilfully a party to such use of his premises, because he might not believe the statement which had been made. Therefore, the words suggested would have no effect, and no indictment or punishment would lie. He would suggest these words—

> "Or having power to determine the existing tenancy declines to do so after having become aware that such premises are used as a brothel."

He believed that a provision of that nature would be effectual.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir John Gorst) said, he had purposely made his words less strong than those of the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite, and he left it to the person prosecuting to prove—

> "That the landlord or lessor knowingly permitted the house to be used as a brothel,"

He thought the words he had proposed were quite adequate for the purpose.

Mr. LYULPH STANLEY objected to the proposed Amendment, and hoped the Government would adhere to the words they had placed upon the Paper.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. A. R. D. ELLIOT asked what would be the effect of the penalty? Would the cases be triable summarily, or by jury?

Mr. M'COAN said, that after the acceptance of the Amendment of the hon. Member for Liverpool (Mr. S. Smith), he thought the Government would have little difficulty in acceding to another which he (Mr. M'Coan) had placed upon the Paper, the object of which was to provide that the penalty should be increased. They punished the keeper of a brothel who let his upper rooms for a misdemeanour; but he might simply be carrying on a lawful business as an hotel keeper, who happened to let a bed-room to persons who conducted themselves reasonably while on the premises, and yet they scrupled to inflict an adequate punishment on the worst offender of all — the man who lived by this immoral traffic. What did they do to him after having made it a punishable offence to use a room in a coffee-house for immoral purposes? They let off the regular brothel keeper with a penalty of £20. Why, it was only 20 pence or 20 farthings to a man who was carrying on a prosperous business. It was in the discretion of the public to give him two months' imprisonment; but the punishment in the two cases was altogether unequal, and was much less severe upon a brothel-house keeper who employed the whole of his time in the business, than in the case of the coffee-house keeper who quietly lent a room.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL remarked, that the Amendment to which the hon. Member was addressing his remarks had been withdrawn.

Mr. M'COAN said, his object in addressing the House was to move that the word "£20," in line 31 of Clause 10, should be omitted in order to substitute "£50."

Mr. SPEAKER: It is not competent for the hon. Member to move an Amendment which would have the effect of raising the penalty.

Mr. M'COAN said, he was not aware that there was any Rule in existence which precluded him from doing that; but the ruling of the Speaker would dispose of two or three other similar Amendments which he had intended to propose on this clause. [*A laugh.*] It was not so much a laughing matter as some hon. Members seemed to think. He did not at all see the logic of the clause. They imposed a heavy penalty on the offender who was the least culpable; and they dealt very lightly with the person who employed the whole of his time in this immoral traffic. They merely imposed a twopenny-halfpenny penalty, which was simply ridiculous.

Mr. SPEAKER said, there was no Question before the House. It was not competent for the hon. Member to propose an increase of the penalty, or to discuss the propriety of increasing it.

Mr. M'COAN said, that he wished to move an Amendment upon Clause 11.

Mr. SPEAKER: We have not yet disposed of Clause 10.

Mr. A. R. D. ELLIOT said, that in line 33 the punishment was two months' imprisonment. He wished to know if the Government had any special reason for making it two months, because the effect would be to make the Bill practically inoperative?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER pointed out that there was no Question before the House.

Mr. A. R. D. ELLIOT said, that he had simply asked a Question.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he would propose his Amendment in Clause 10, to leave out from "Nothing in this section," (Mr. S. Smith), declined to treat as brothels.

Amendment proposed,

In page 6, line 18, by inserting the words "the expression 'brothel' means any house or part thereof which is kept and used for the purposes of prostitution."—(*Mr. M'Coan.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE SOLICITOR GENERAL (Sir JOHN GORST) said, it was rather inconvenient to have to discuss an Amendment of this character without Notice. The definition proposed by the hon. Member was of extreme importance, because it would have, if adopted, the effect of very greatly extending the number of criminal offences dealt with in the Bill, and yet the hon. Member proposed to the House to insert it on his Motion at that hour of the night, without the House having had any opportunity of considering it. As far as he could gather from the words read by the hon. Member, he proposed a definition so wide that it would include possibly a room in which a lady might be temporarily residing. He thought it would be wiser to allow the term to be defined by the common sense of the Judges and juries before whom the cases might be brought.

MR. THOROLD ROGERS said, the hon. and learned Gentleman had opposed these words in the most elastic sense. He had told the House just now that it would include places of the very class they were trying to get rid of; and then he said that the clause was so wide that he did not wish to have this latitude given to the term. Such opposition as that was hardly intelligible, and it justified the belief that there was an attempt being made to exclude from the operation of the Act the worst possible practices and the worst possible places of the kind referred to. He was astonished that anyone with the experience of the hon. and learned Gentleman should have put forward such grounds of objection. What was the meaning of the expression in the Bill? He had been listening with anxiety for the whole evening to learn what that was; and if, under those circumstances, the House were to be told that what was the meaning in some circumstances was not the meaning in others, he could only say that so far as he was concerned he was left entirely in a haze about it. The hon. Member (Mr. M'Coan) had moved an Amendment which was intended to clear up this state of obscurity; and he was bound to say that they ought to have a definition before they passed from the question. He thought the whole statement of the hon. and learned Solicitor General was highly unsatisfactory.

SIR HENRY JAMES said, he did not think there was any reason for treating his hon. and learned Friend the Solicitor General roughly. His own opinion was against defining this word at all; but if it were necessary to have a definition at all, that of the hon. Member would not suffice, because it would apply to any room or part of a house in which a man was living with a concubine.

Question put, and *negatived.*

On Motion of Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS, the following Amendment made:—Clause 14, page 7, line 6, leave out "of" and insert "or."

MR. HOPWOOD said, he thought it would be better to reserve trials for misdemeanour and felony under the Act for the Superior Courts, so that they might be tried by Judges of superior knowledge. He understood that the Irish Representatives were satisfied with trial at Quarter Sessions, and therefore he proposed to restrict the operation of his Amendment to England.

Amendment proposed, to add at the end of Clause 14—

"And no indictment under the provisions of this Act shall in England be tried in any Court of Quarter Sessions."—(*Mr. Hopwood.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): Sir, I have now to ask that, having completed the consideration of the Bill as amended in Committee, we may be allowed to read the Bill the third time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read the third time, and *passed,* with Amendments.

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (ENGLAND) BILL.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman the

Leader of the House, whether he will take this Bill as the first Order of the Day on Monday?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Yes, Sir.

SEA FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT BILL.—[*Lords.*]—[Bill 258.]

(*Secretary Baron Henry De Worms.*)

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

Clause 4 (Fishery Board may make bye-laws prohibiting or regulating trawling within defined areas).

Mr. C. S. PARKER pointed out that one of the sections provided that a bye-law under this Act should not be of any validity until it was confirmed by one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State. The House had agreed to create a Secretary for Scotland, and a great deal of pains had been taken to find business to occupy his time. It seemed to him, in these circumstances, rather strange that after doing that they should be creating new duties for the Secretary of State, instead of giving them to the new Minister for Scotland. He moved to substitute for "one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State" the words "the Secretary for Scotland."

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 2, to leave out the words "one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State," and insert the words "the Secretary for Scotland."—(*Mr. C. S. Parker*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

On Motion of The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms), the following Amendments made:—Page 2, line 26, after "conviction," leave out to end of Clause; Clause 5, page 3, line 8, after "directing," leave out "the," and insert "their;" page 3, line 8, after "officers," leave out "in their employment."

Mr. ASHER proposed to omit from Clause 6, line 14, the words "and within the exclusive fishery limits of the British Islands." This clause required statistics to be given of the fish caught; but as it stood at present it was merely applicable to the territorial waters within three miles of the shore. He thought the clause would be altogether unworkable if it were left in that position. It was, of course, quite impossible for a fisherman coming into port in charge of a boat to say what proportion of fish he had caught within the three mile limit and what proportion outside that limit. He thought that the clause should be made applicable to the catch of fish, whether made within or without the territorial waters.

Amendment proposed,

In Clause 6, line 14, to leave out the words "and within the exclusive fishery limits of the British Islands."—(*Mr. Asher.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The SECRETARY to the BOARD (Baron Henry De Worms) assented to the Amendment.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Mr. C. S. PARKER proposed to omit from lines 17 and 20 the words "one of Her Majesty's principal Secretaries of State" and insert "the Secretary for Scotland."

Amendment *agreed to.*

On the Motion of The Secretary to the Board (Baron Henry De Worms), the following Amendments made:—Clause 7, page 4, line 13, after "necessary," leave out "on the question of the damage;" Clause 8, page 4, line 21, after "person," leave out "whose property," and insert "who;" Clause 8, page 4, line 28, after "proceed," leave out "according to the provisions of Clause seven hereof," and insert—

"To consider and dispose of the question of compensation to the injured party, and if a report of a sea fishery officer has been produced, as set forth in Clause seven hereof, the sheriff shall not allow any additional evidence to be heard unless he shall consider it to be necessary in order to do justice in the case; and, if he shall allow additional evidence, the accused person shall be allowed to be examined as a witness on the question of the amount of damages;"

Clause 8, page 4, line 31, after "damages," insert "and shall, after hearing parties, give decree as in an ordinary action before the Sheriff Court."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Clause 8, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

Mr. ASHER said that in Committee he proposed an alternative clause which, in his opinion, carried out the intention embodied in the clause more effectually than this clause did. The difference was, however, merely a matter of drafting; and as it had been considered by the Government desirable to retain the clause in its present shape he did not propose to offer any opposition to it.

Motion *agreed to.*

Mr. R. W. DUFF said that before Report was disposed of, he desired to ask if the Government could give the House any information as to what steps were being taken, in accordance with the recommendations of the Trawling Commission, for the protection of fishing vessels? The vessels at present employed on the coast of Scotland in the work of protection were quite obsolete. He had raised the question on the Scotch Fishery Vote and on the Navy Estimates, and he wished to again ask what was being done by the Admiralty to provide efficient vessels. He had received an assurance from the Admiralty that they intended to do something, and he hoped that intention would be carried out, otherwise the Bill would be quite useless.

The SECRETARY to the BOARD (Baron Henry De Worms) said, he had been in communication with the Admiralty, and he had every reason to believe that arrangements were being made for the proper protection of the fishing vessel.

Bill read the third time, and *passed,* with Amendments.

COUNTY OFFICERS AND COURTS (IRELAND) (PENSIONS) BILL.—[Bill 112.]

(*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland.*)

COMMITTEE.

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clauses 1 to 3, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Mr. SEXTON proposed the following Clause:—

"On the date of the passing of this Act, George Augustus Hamilton Chichester, commonly called the Earl of Belfast, shall cease to hold the office of clerk of the peace for the county of Antrim, and, until the appointment of his successor, the duties of the said office shall be discharged by the deputy clerk of the peace for the said county, and the new clerk of the peace shall be appointed as if a vacancy had been caused in the said office by the death or resignation of the said George Augustus Hamilton Chichester, who shall be awarded, out of the salary and emoluments of the said office, a pension of fifty pounds per annum."

The hon. Gentleman said, he thought it would scarcely be denied by anyone that this gentleman should never have been appointed to the office he now held. Thirty-five years ago it happened that the Lord Lieutenant of the county of Antrim was the uncle of George Augustus Hamilton Chichester, and in pursuance of a system which had long obtained in Ireland the noble Lord thought he was quite at liberty to appoint whoever he liked Clerk of the Peace of the county without any regard at all to the public interest. Therefore by a flagrant act of jobbery the Lord Lieutenant of the county conferred the office on the Earl of Belfast, at that time Mr. Chichester, a person who had no qualification whatever for the office. The office of Clerk of the Peace required considerable qualification. The person holding the office should have the legal qualification of a solicitor in order to discharge the duties efficiently. Mr. Chichester possessed no qualification for the office at all, and since his appointment he had not resided for a year or even a month in county Antrim, or any other part of Ireland. But the job, having occurred so long ago, might now be pardoned if the person had had the common decency to devote himself to the performance of his duties. He (Mr. Sexton) had looked through the official records, and he found that the address of the Clerk of the Peace of County Antrim was Great George Street, Westminster, London. The Earl of Belfast was actually without an Irish address deputing his duties as he did to a person to whom he paid a salary of £200 a-year. He (Mr. Sexton) believed the emoluments of the office amounted to £1,600, so that the Earl of Belfast pocketed £1,400 a-year and lived in London. The Earl of Belfast appeared to be one of the persons who thought that offices paid for by the money of the people were made for the purpose of finding places for the sons of the aristocracy. Such a thing as duty never entered into their minds. Transactions of this kind might be suffered in past times, but the days for tolerating them were gone. The duties of Clerks of the Peace were now far more important than formerly. The franchise had been extended to the general body of the people, and he was not surprised to hear bitter complaints from County Antrim with regard to the manner in which the duties of the Clerk of the Peace had been discharged. The law intended that on the 22nd of July the lists of voters and claimants of votes should be published, so that every man in the county should have an opportunity for 13 days of examining the lists in order to see that the names which ought to appear there did not appear. He was informed that for nine days after the time prescribed by law there had not been published any list of the voters in North Antrim. Was it to be pretended that this man who had held office for 35 years, who had never taken the trouble to live in Ireland, but who had taken the trouble to receive in all £56,000 out of the public funds, should any longer retain the office? Was it to be said that the Earl of Belfast, by his neglect and his atrocious disregard of the public interest, should be allowed to deprive the people of Antrim of a right they were by law entitled to—namely, the right of 13 days' inspection of the list of voters? He asserted that if the Earl of Belfast had not disfranchised a great many people in Antrim he was practically responsible for their disfranchisement. He might be told this was a patent office, and therefore could not be disturbed. It was a patent fraud. Parliament could do what it pleased, and therefore he asked the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) to give him the aid of the Government in putting an end to this scandal, and securing to the people that due discharge of the duties of the office of Clerk of the Peace for the county of Antrim which they demanded. He claimed that the holder of this office should be a solicitor, that he should live in the county, and be a gentleman not above the common honesty of devoting himself every day to the duties of the office. That was not an unreasonable claim. If the Government were not prepared to assent to such a claim he asked whether the Lord Lieutenant would use his influence to induce the Earl of Belfast to perform the duties of his office or else resign? The people could accept no other terms. He had made provision in the clause for the payment of a pension to the Earl of Belfast of £50 a-year, and that he considered very ample and liberal considering that that nobleman had done nothing at all except drawn £56,000 from the people.

New Clause (Clerk of the Peace of County Antrim to vacate office,)—(*Mr. Sexton,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be read a second time."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he believed the Earl of Belfast was appointed to the office of Clerk of Peace for the county of Antrim in 1849, and that at the time he was appointed to the office it was in the gift of the Lord Lieutenant of the county. The tenure by which he had held the office and held it still was a tenure for life. At the time he was appointed he had the right conferred by statute to appoint a deputy, and that right he exercised. A deputy had attended to the duties, and assuming that the deputy performed the duties properly the terms on which the appointment was originally made were complied with. He (the Attorney General for Ireland) was prepared to admit at once that the tenure of office was not a satisfactory one; but the Committee would bear in mind that in the year 1877 an Act of Parliament was passed for the very purpose of meeting the objections to which the hon. Member had called attention. That Act provided that in future the duties of the office of Clerk of the Peace and Clerks of the Crown should be performed in person, that the power of appointing a deputy should be abolished, and that for the purpose of getting rid as quickly as possible of Clerks of the Peace and Clerks of the Crown who did not perform their duties favourable terms should be given as an inducement to them to resign. In most of the counties of Ireland the terms which had been offered had been accepted, and now, in most instances, Clerks of the Peace and Clerks of the Crown were performing their duties in person. There were one or two gentlemen who retained their appointments on the old terms, having appointed deputies. He did not think Parliament would be disposed to go further than they had gone by the Act of 1877. Now, if the gentleman who had been appointed by the Earl of Belfast to perform the duties of Clerk of the Peace in County Antrim had not performed the duties properly, another question, of course, would be opened up. The hon. Member (Mr. Sexton) had said that the lists of voters in North Antrim were not published within the time prescribed by statute; but the hon. Gentleman was, no doubt, aware that in some of the counties of Ireland, where the Clerks of the Peace had been most efficient, there had been necessarily a delay of a day or two in the publication of voters' lists. He (the Attorney General for Ireland) did not say that the Earl of Belfast's deputy had discharged his duty properly, and neither did he say the gentleman had discharged his duty improperly. That ought to be the subject of inquiry, but ought not to be a reason for the Committee accepting this clause without inquiry. He would undertake to make the necessary inquiries. It might be shown to the satisfaction of the Government that the non-publication of the lists within the proper time was owing to circumstances over which the deputy had no control. In that case he was sure the hon. Gentleman would not wish any penalty to be imposed. He asked the hon. Gentleman, having regard to the Act of 1877 and to the fact that the change he desired had in great measure been carried out, not to press his clause.

Mr. T. P. O'CONNOR said, he should advise his hon. Friend to go to a division, and he should not be surprised if Her Majesty's Government found, as the result of that division, that the House of Commons would not tolerate any longer these absurdities. He would venture to say that if a report of this discussion could appear in the English newspapers at any length to-morrow, the English people would be astounded at the fact that in the present day there existed a man who could get £56,000 of public money without performing a day's or an hour's work for it—who was appointed as far back as 1849, who received £1,600 a-year, and, therefore, had had as much as £56,000 for doing nothing. The hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) told them that not only did that gentleman do nothing, but that he did not even make a pretence of doing anything, and did not often reside in Ireland—as a matter of fact had no address in the country. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland was evidently guilty on all the counts of the indictment passed on him. He had said there was an Act passed in 1877, and that that Act should have provided for the compulsory retirement of the Earl of Belfast. Well, if it did not, that was no argument against their doing it now, but, on the contrary, was an argument in favour of its being done now. With regard to the question of neglect of duty, he often found that officials in Ireland were guilty of irregularities in a manner which would not be permitted in any other country in the world. Would anyone credit it that a law could be passed enfranchising householders of counties, and that an official drawing £1,600 a-year without residing in the country could be allowed, by neglecting his duties under the Act, actually to disfranchise county householders? He (Mr. T. P. O'Connor) took it that by this time the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland ought to have made out some case against the statement of his (Mr. T. P. O'Connor's) hon. Friend the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton). This was by no means the first time that the hon. Member had made a complaint against the manner in which the Earl of Belfast and his deputy discharged their duties. The hon. Member for Sligo, who was a most careful investigator of facts brought before his notice, would not have ventured to have brought these charges against the Earl of Belfast if he had not known that they were true. What were these facts? Why, that during the interval between the 22nd of July and the 4th of August persons were to be put on the lists who were entitled to be there, but that in County Antrim seven of the 13 days' interval passed without the people knowing whether they were on the lists or not. That was an intolerable state of things, which should certainly not be allowed to last for another year. He thought the Committee should now go to a division, and felt sure that when they did the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite would find that he was not generally supported.

Mr. BIGGAR said, he thought that if the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) would amend his clause so as to provide that the Earl of Belfast should get his pension on the scale of the Act of 1877 it would be satisfactory to all parties. The position of the Earl of Belfast was rather peculiar. He was—as had been pointed out—a gentleman who neglected his duties, but who had figured a great deal in the Law Courts in London. He had figured a great deal in the Divorce Court, and as to his wife's portion—for not paying his wife an allowance he had undertaken to pay her. On those grounds he was not a very desirable sort of person to have in an official position; but besides that his position was more satisfactory than it was formerly, because on the death of the late Lord Donegall he became entitled on reversion to a considerable property. It would not, therefore, be so much a grievance to him to be compelled to retire now as it might have been in 1877, when, so far as he (Mr. Biggar) knew, he had no means except his salary as Clerk of the Peace. Now he had a valuable property which he could mortgage, and there was not the slightest doubt he had mortgaged it. If the Government would agree to an amendment of the clause to the effect that the pension should be regulated according to the Act of 1877, it would be satisfactory to all parties.

MR. O'SHEA said, that what had been proposed by the hon. Gentleman who had just sat down (Mr. Biggar) would be a very fair solution of this difficulty. No doubt, if the Amendments, as proposed by the hon. Member for Sligo, were carried, they would affect other people. Other Clerks of the Peace appointed under the old system, who still held their appointments, and performed their duties most satisfactorily, would also be affected. Under all the circumstances of the case, the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cavan was an extremely fair one—one which would meet the circumstances of the case of the Earl of Belfast, without hitting other people who were performing their duties satisfactorily.

MR. LYULPH STANLEY asked whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland would undertake to inquire as to the delay in preparing the lists, and if he found that it had been wilful would remove the officer?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he would undertake to inquire as to the delay in preparing the lists, and if it was found to be wilful would take such steps as it was in the power of the Government to take to deal with the matter. He did not know what steps could be taken; but if they found that there had been such wilful neglect of duty as had been described something would be done.

MR. LABOUCHERE asked whether the Government was going to support the right of this gentleman to prey any longer on the public Treasury? He (Mr. Labouchere) had heard of Belfast, but he certainly did not know that there was an Earl of Belfast. This Earl of Belfast might be a most respectable gentleman—he might be, or he might not be; but even if he were the most respectable of human beings, why was he to continue to prey in this manner upon the public Treasury? He had received £56,000 already; he employed a person to do his work to whom he paid £300 a-year; he never went near the scene of his duties; he did nothing; and now they were asked in the clause of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo to give him a small pension to enable him to retire. Though this was at the present moment the rump of Parliament, the Government were passing through Bill after Bill after the Appropriation Bill had been read a third time, quite contrary to all rule. Seeing that they were taking this course, however, he thought they should accept the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo, which was a most reasonable one, and should not seek to upset it by their mechanical majority. [*Laughter.*] Yes, "mechanical majority," for at that hour and at that period of the Session a Government—even a Government in a minority—always had a mechanical majority waiting upon it. The Government seemed disposed to reject this reasonable proposal, and to force the House to pay this £1,600 to an absentee Irish landlord for doing nothing. They had heard of an alliance between the Conservative Government and the Irish Party. How long would that last if these monstrosities continued. Did not his hon. Friends the Irish Members know that if the Liberals had been in power they would have accepted the clause of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sligo? He hoped that would enlighten his hon. Friends, and that now they would know what they had to expect from a Conservative Government.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 15; Noes 46: Majority 31.—(Div. List, No. 280.)

MR. SEXTON said, he begged now to move the second clause on the Paper in his name, which was in the following terms:—

> "From the date of the passing of this Act no clerk of the Crown or clerk of the peace in Ireland shall be awarded any pension on quitting office, unless he shall have personally discharged the duties of his office, and resided within the county for which he was appointed to act."

He should think that failure to discharge duty, or absence from the county for which a Clerk of the Crown was appointed to act should procure dismissal; but as this was only a Pension Bill he would not propose a clause of that kind. He kept within the scope of the Bill by proposing that in case of failure to discharge duties or absence from the county there should be no pension awarded. He was strongly convinced that the time had come when a most strict observance of duty by a certain class of servants in Ireland was necessary. Those who had to deal with the franchise would have to deal with much larger bodies than was formerly the case; and he could not contemplate with equanimity such a state of affairs continuing as that in which officials charged with the management of the franchise were allowed to leave their districts altogether. Such a state of affairs was not to be tolerated, and he thought the House, whatever was done this year, should certainly put a stop to it next year. In the case of Major Wynne, Clerk of the Peace for the county of Sligo, Chief Justice Morris at the Sligo Assizes had found the books in such a state that he had to call the Clerk of the Peace to his presence. His Lordship fined the Clerk £20, and £20 for as many two hours as he was absent. He (Mr. Sexton) did not know how many hours elapsed before Major Wynne appeared, but however long it was nothing had been levied. Irish officials had a certain easy, familiar way of settling differences of this kind amicably amongst themselves. There was a certain freemasonry between the Judges and the other officials engaged in the administration of the law. It was reported to him from Grange, in County Sligo, that the lists of voters which should have been published on the 22nd of last month had not been published on the 1st of this month. He did not know whether they had been published yet—he rather thought they had not. The law said that the lists should be prepared on the 22nd of July, and 13 days' interval was allowed for persons to get on the list. Ten days of that period had elapsed when he was informed that the lists had not been posted, so that the people even then had only three days instead of 13 to examine the lists. What was to be done with those people? Suppose a man whose name ought to be on the list found that it was not on, and pointed out the error too late. He would not be able to make a claim, and he would, therefore, be without a vote at a time, from a Parliamentary point of view, more critical than any other in the history of Ireland. What reparation could be made to such a man? If, on the other hand, a man's name was on the list which should not be there, and it was too late for either of the political Parties to get it struck off, what reparation could be made to them? Certain electors had gone down to Sligo to find out why the lists had not been published. They made inquiries, and were first told that the lists were published. The visitors, however, convinced the Clerks that that was not the case. Then it was said that the Clerks of the Unions had not sent in the Returns, but that was found to be inaccurate; and, finally, it was said that the printers had not been able to do the work. But why had they not been able to do it? They had had as much time as anyone else. No matter what the list was in Sligo the Nationalists were going to win; but, he would ask, was this not a proper case for complaint? In mentioning the case of Sligo he had other gains elsewhere in view. He would forbear from giving any further details and particulars; but he would ask that the counties should be relieved of the burden of these officials, and that Major Wynne should be removed from an office which he had been proved unfit to hold.

New Clause (Award of pension to depend upon personal discharge of duty,) —(*Mr. Sexton,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be read a second time."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, that if the hon. Member would allow him he would refer to the last portion of his speech first. The Clerk of the Peace for the county of Sligo was a gentleman of the name of Wynne; but he could tell the hon. Member that before he had put this matter on the Paper the Government had felt it necessary to call upon that gentleman to explain his conduct in regard to the duties of his office, and an investigation on the matter was proceeding. If it was found that he had been derelict in his duty he would not escape censure, and, if necessary, he would be removed from his office. If it was found that he had been remiss in his duties, he would be dealt with in such a way as to show that no favour was shown to anyone. In future Clerks of the Peace would not be entitled to delegate their trusts to deputies; but he would remind the hon. Member that there were a few Clerks in Ireland who had been appointed under the old system, and they had appointed deputies, as they had a perfect right to do, who were carrying on the business with the greatest efficiency. He thought it would be a hard thing that a gentleman who had held such an office for some time, and had had the right to appoint a deputy, and whose deputy had performed the work with efficiency—that he should have new burdens put upon him by a clause of this sort. He and his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir William Hart Dyke) were opposed to this method of doing business, and he could assure the hon. Member that no further appointments of this kind would be made. At the same time, was it desirable to interfere with an existing system under which somebody did the work efficiently?

Mr. SEXTON regarded the speech of the right hon. and learned Gentleman as generally satisfactory. With regard to the general question, he quite agreed that it was not desirable to interfere with the discharge of the duty by a deputy where the deputy was doing his duty well. If they would not pass this clause, however, he wished to know whether there was any objection to the Lord Lieutenant addressing a letter to those gentlemen, and to point out to them that they were to remain in their counties and perform their duties personally?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) pointed out that under the Act of 1877 it was necessary that the Clerk of the Peace should attend personally; but it was not necessary in any way that he should be permanently resident in the county.

Mr. SEXTON remarked that they would see what effect this discussion had between that and that time next year. In the meantime he begged leave to withdraw his clause.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Bill *reported,* without Amendment.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes): Perhaps the House will allow me to take the third reading of the Bill now.

Motion made, and Question, "That the Bill be now read the third time," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *passed.*

REGISTRATION APPEALS (IRELAND) BILL [*Lords*].—[Bill 259.]

(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

COMMITTEE.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, the object of this Bill was simply to allow the Court of Appeal to sit at an earlier time than it could now sit for the hearing of Registration Appeals. Under the present law they could not sit until late in November, and it would be impossible for them to deal with all the business which the Government expected would come before them this year if they did not meet earlier than that.

Bill *considered* in Committee, and *reported,* without Amendment; read the third time, and *passed.*

LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) [ADVANCES].

Resolution [6th August] *reported.*

"That it is expedient to authorise Advances out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom, of any sum or sums of money not exceeding £5,000,000 in the whole, to enable the Land Commission in Ireland to make Advances for the purchase of estates, in pursuance of the provisions of any Act of the present Session, for providing greater facilities for the sale of land to occupying tenants in Ireland."

Mr. LEA wished to ask what time on Monday this Resolution would come on?

The SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Mr. Akers-Douglas) said, it would be the second Order.

Mr. LEA asked whether it would come on before 12 o'clock?

The CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir William Hart Dyke): I hope so.

Resolution *agreed to.*

POLICE ENFRANCHISEMENT EXTENSION BILL.—[Bill 219.]

(*Mr. Coleridge Kennard, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, Mr. Cowen, Lord Claud John Hamilton, Mr. Robert Fowler, Mr. Reid, Mr. Houldsworth, Mr. George Elliot.*)

COMMITTEE. [ADJOURNED DEBATE.]

Adjourned Debate on going into Committee [5th August].

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Debate be further adjourned till Monday next."

Mr. LYULPH STANLEY wished to say, on the Question that this Bill be put off until Monday, that it was not fair to continue a Bill of this sort on the Orders at that period of the Session, when the Appropriation Bill had been read a third time. There was a very great difference with regard to this measure in the House; and at that period of the Session, when they had such a thin House, it ought not to be further put off. He should like to move that the Bill be taken on that day three months, or that the Order be discharged, if he would be in Order in doing so.

Mr. SPEAKER said, it was hardly usual on a measure of this sort to move such a Resolution in the absence of the Member who was in charge of the Bill.

Mr. LYULPH STANLEY said, he did not think it fair that the Bill should be put down at that period of the Session. If he were in Order he would ask that it be taken on Monday week.

Mr. SPEAKER said, that the course proposed by the hon. Gentleman would be very unusual in the absence of the hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill.

Mr. LYULPH STANLEY said, he would like to hear what the Government had to say on the subject, and for that purpose he would make an appeal to the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department. The Appropriation Bill having been read a third time and there having been a distinct understanding some time ago that contested matters should not be pushed on at that stage of the Session, he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman as to whether it was fair that this Bill should be proceeded with.

The SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, the Bill had been approved by several Members on both sides of the House. He was willing to adjourn the debate till Monday next.

Debate *further adjourned* till *Monday* next.

POOR LAW GUARDIANS (IRELAND) BILL.—[Bill 245.]

(*Mr. John Redmond, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Gray, Mr. Barry.*)

LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Mr. SEXTON rose to move that the consideration of the Lords' Amendments be deferred till the 21st of August. He wished to point out that when the Bill left that House last year a compromise had been arrived at, and Irish Members informed the House that it was the smallest measure they could accept. The Lords had excluded some points of the scheme which he thought they must object to. If the Government were resolved to maintain the Amendments of the Lords, he thought that any further time spent on the Bill would be wasted, because in the next Session of Parliament it would be necessary for Irish Members to insist on a fuller and more adequate measure of reform.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Consideration of the Lords' Amendments be deferred till Friday the 21st of August."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

House adjourned at a quarter before
Two o'clock till Monday next.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Monday, 10*th August*, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*First Reading*—County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (Pensions) * (244).

Report — Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2) * (241-245).

Third Reading—River Thames (No. 2) (238); Metropolitan Police Staff Superannuation * (222); Public Works Loans * 234); Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) *; East India Army Pensions Deficiency * (239), and *passed*.

Withdrawn—Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) * (190).

RIVER THAMES (No. 2) BILL.—(No. 238.)

(*The Lord Mount-Temple.*)

THIRD READING. [ADJOURNED DEBATE.]

Adjourned debate on the Motion for the third reading resumed (according to Order).

Amendment *moved*,

In page 2, after line 18, at end, to add—"Provided that nothing in this Act, or in any bye-law made thereunder, shall be construed to deprive any riparian owner of any legal rights in the soil or bed of the river which he may now possess, or of any legal remedies he may now possess, for prevention of anchoring, mooring, loitering, or delay of any boat or other vessel."—(*The Earl of Abingdon.*)

LORD MOUNT-TEMPLE expressed his acceptance of the Amendment.

Bill read 3ª.

On Motion, "That the Bill do pass?"

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said, that rowing men objected to the Bill on the ground that it would give a statutory sanction to obstructions which ought not to be legalized. Those who desired to set up these obstructions ought to take their chance at Common Law.

LORD MOUNT-TEMPLE said, he felt confident that when the Act should come into operation obstructions would diminish instead of increasing.

Motion *agreed to*.

Bill *passed*, and sent to the Commons.

ARMY—FIELD ARTILLERY AND SMALL ARMS.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS asked the Under Secretary of State for War the following Questions:—Whether the muzzle velocity of the 40-pounder gun is 1,108 feet per second, equal to an extreme useful range of 4,000 yards; whether at the time when these guns were made, about 25 years ago, the muzzle velocity of the 12-pounder field piece was 1,170 feet per second, with an extreme useful range of about 3,000 yards; and, whether the muzzle velocity of the 9-pounder field piece was 1,057, equal to an extreme useful range of about 2,500 yards; whether the extreme useful range of the best German, French, and Russian field pieces is not now about 5,000 yards; whether the range of the new British field pieces is not also about 5,000 yards; whether it is not the fact that in the late Afghan War the 40-pounder gun proved of little service for battering purposes owing to its slow velocity; whether, seeing that the range of the 40-pounder gun is inferior to that of the new Foreign and British field pieces, he will consider the practicability of increasing its power and range; whether any steps are being taken to give an improved bayonet, and to attach a repeating arrangement to the Martini-Henry rifle? The noble Earl said that the advance in scientific artillery had been such that the 12-pounder and 16-pounder were now more efficient field guns than the weightier 40-pounder. He thought that if the suggestions contained in the Questions were right, it was time to bring home the responsibility for our armaments to the proper quarter, and rouse those entrusted with these matters to a proper sense of their duty. If it could be possible to restore to the 40-pounder, by some change in its construction, greater relative power as compared with the lighter pieces, the safety of our shores would *pro tanto* be increased. With reference to his Question about bayonets, he wished to explain that, in order to compensate for the shortness of the Martini-Henry, the regulation weapon was now three inches longer than it was formerly. On several occasions in the Soudan, notably in the attack on General M'Neill's zereba, the bayonets bent and twisted. A Question had been asked in "another place" on the subject, and a very strange answer was given—namely, that the bayonet when used for stabbing must either twist or break. That was a very sad state of things, for bayonets were made for the purpose of stabbing men in warfare. Why have such a bayonet? He would remind their Lordships that some years ago a Committee recommended a sword bayonet of a totally different form, which was an admirable cutting weapon, and one which also made a first-rate bayonet for stabbing purposes. There was also the American trowel bayonet, which might be tried. With reference to the desirability of attaching a repeating arrangement to the Martini-Henry rifle, it was sufficient to say that one of the chief improvements in the art of martial destruction was the invention of the repeating arm, which contained in the stock or elsewhere a certain number of cartridges. The Swiss weapon, he believed, contained 11 cartridges. When the whole magazine was expended, it then became a simple breech-loading rifle. If money was to be spent in providing superior firearms for our Army, it would be better to do so in attaching this arrangement to the existing arms than in the construction of any new arm.

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for the COLONIES (The Earl of Dunraven) (who replied) said, he regretted that the noble Lord the Under Secretary of State for War (Viscount Bury), who, unavoidably, from a domestic cause, the death of a near relative, was not in his place, not only on account of the cause, but because he would have given the noble Earl information which it was not in his (the Earl of Dunraven's) own power to give. He would, however, give the noble Earl the best answer he could; but it was not in his power to go into very full details. The noble Earl seemed to attribute most importance to his seventh Question, as to attaching a repeating arrangement to the Martini-Henry rifle. He saw the force of the noble Earl's observations; but, up to the present, all the repeating arrangements were liable to the defect of getting more quickly out of order than other arms. But the whole matter, both as to adopting a repeating arrangement to the small arms as well as that of the best form of bayonet, had at present been referred to the Small Arms Committee, and was occupying their attention at present. As to the first Question, the noble Earl was substantially correct. The muzzle velocity of the 40-pounder was 1,180 feet per second, and its range at 10 degrees elevation was 3,650 yards. As to the second Question, the muzzle velocity of the 12-pounder rifled breech-loading field-piece was 1,239 feet per second, and its range at 10 degrees elevation was 3,350 yards. The muzzle velocity of the 9-pounder rifled breech-loading field-piece was 1,055 feet per second, and its range at 10 degrees elevation was 3,100 yards. As to the third Question, the ranges of the present foreign field-guns at 10 degrees varied somewhat; but they averaged a little over 4,000 yards. As to the fourth Question, the range of the new 12-pounder at 10 degrees was about 4,380 yards; 9-pounder, 3,250; 13-pounder, 4,280; and 16-pounder, about 3,650. Fifthly, he thought the noble Earl was mistaken in what he had said upon this point; for the 40-pounder used in the late Afghan War was the muzzle-loading gun, and the Report stated that so far as it was tried, its power and accuracy were satisfactory. Sixthly, the modern guns, no doubt, showed a great improvement on those of 25 years ago; but, at the same time, the 40-pounder rifled breech-loading gun introduced in 1859, so far from being obsolete, was still a very useful and accurate weapon. Since that date far more powerful guns had been brought into the Service, and it was considered more satisfactory to use such guns where necessary than to increase the power of the old guns, which could only be done at a comparatively large cost.

THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

The Earl of MILLTOWN, in rising to call attention to the systematic misdescription of this Kingdom in State Papers, especially those relating to foreign affairs, in which it is given the name of Great Britain instead of its proper title the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; and to ask the Prime Minister, Whether he will give instructions to have this error corrected in the future, as it is one which is calculated to lead to misconception and wound the just susceptibilities of the people of Ireland? said, that nothing had tended more to make the Irish people discontented with their lot, and Great Britain odious in their eyes, than the thought that they were not like England and Scotland, a self-ruling Power, but were ruled by a foreign and malignant Power, as they called England. Nothing could be more absurd than such a notion; but it was entertained by the majority of those in Ireland who had lately been admitted to the franchise. They were perfectly convinced that, were it not for the malign influence of England, they would be what they were firmly persuaded they were once—a great, powerful, and contented people. Of course, their Lordships all knew that that was very far from being correct. So far from being governed by England, the Irish people had absolutely the same rights and privileges as their fellow-subjects of the United Kingdom. They were fully represented in the Imperial Parliament, for they sent a somewhat larger number of Representatives to the other Chamber than they were strictly entitled to. But, as long as they entertained their present belief, it was impossible for them to be content with the Union or loyally to cooperate with their fellow-subjects in the other Island, and nothing was more calculated to foster this delusion than the constant practice of ignoring Ireland when describing this Kingdom and its Possessions. Great Britain was only a part of the United Kingdom, a larger part than Ireland certainly, but still only a part; and if a part were put for the whole, the correspondence he held in his hand might just as rightly have been intituled "Correspondence with Ireland" as with "Great Britain." For himself, he could not imagine what difficulty there could be in using the correct appellation "the United Kingdom." "Great Britain" was a false description, and for that reason alone the Government ought to set the matter right, because it tended to make foreigners think that Ireland was a kind of English Poland, instead of its being, as it really was, on a footing of perfect equality with England, and invested with many privileges which England did not possess. If only the people of Ireland could understand their true position in this great Empire, which the genius of Irish statesmen and the valour of Irish soldiers had so much aided in creating, Ireland would become in heart, as it had long been in right, an integral portion of the United Kingdom.

After some remarks from Lord WAVENEY,

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: This is a very difficult Question to answer, because I do not entertain the views which my noble Friend (the Earl of Milltown) has expressed with regard to the facility with which an alteration in the vocabulary respecting this title could be carried out. On the contrary, I see very great difficulties in it. "The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland" is not a term which lends itself to literary manipulation. For example, if we wanted to convert it into an adjective, would the adjective be constructed by the termination "ish;" and, if so, where would the "ish" come in? Should we have to say "The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Irelandish?"

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, he did not ask for an adjectivial alteration; it was the alteration of the substantive which he wished to bring about.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: But in constructing sentences you will always find one expression for the adjective, and another wholly different for the substantive; and in this case, of course, it would be difficult to have one expression for the adjective and another for the substantive. That, however, is not a new difficulty. We had it many years ago with respect to Scotland, when we were forbidden to use the word "England" only, because that was a reflection on that great country; but the Scotch, I believe, have been set at ease by the consideration that it is they who annexed England, and not England who annexed Scotland, and that they have acquired the right to use the word "England," and make it their property. But whether Ireland has annexed England or not as yet I do not know at present, and will not say; but I believe that that annexation has not yet taken place, and, therefore, there is some difficulty in consenting to the alteration proposed by my noble Friend, to whom I would point out that if we yielded to his demand and made the change he suggests we should be opening the sluices—letting in the thin end of the wedge—to a great variety of similar things. By agreeing to it we should only expose ourselves to still larger demands from more powerful populations—demands which it will be even still more difficult to resist. After all, India, the Colonies, Australia, and Canada are all bound up by every Act of this "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland;" and if we wish to be accurate we ought to include every one of those places in every inscription of that compound adjective. On the whole, I think my noble Friend ought to have addressed his Question to the head of the Education Office, for I am wholly incompetent to deal with the difficulties it raises. If that Department will furnish me with the necessary substantives and adjectives in the English language which are suitable for the expression of my noble Friend's ideas it will give me great pleasure to consider them. I will only say that if anything would reconcile us to the literary difficulties which he threatens to introduce and impose upon us in the art of writing despatches it would be the prospect he holds out that we should, by making the change, avoid injuring the just susceptibilities of the people of Ireland. There would also be the hope that anything we can do in the matter would lessen the difficulties of government in Ireland, as to which there is no object which the Government have more at heart; and if my noble Friend will aid us with his linguistic and grammatical acquirements in that great enterprize he will deserve the thanks of us all.

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN said, that "Great Britain" was wrong, and "the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland" was right, according to the Act of Union. That was the form he desired should be used, instead of the former.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY—CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMISSION.—OBSERVATIONS.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (The Earl of IDDESLEIGH), in rising, according to Notice, to make a statement with regard to the proposed Royal Commission for inquiring into the extent, nature, and probable causes of the depression now or recently existing in various branches of trade and industry, said: Your Lordships are aware that it is the intention of the Government to issue a Royal Commission for the purpose of inquiring into the extent, the nature, and the probable causes of the depression now existing, or which has recently existed, in various branches of trade and industry. Although no Questions have been put in your Lordships' House on the subject, still, no doubt, it is right that before the close of the Session the Government should state what is their intention in issuing this Commission, and what progress has been made in bringing it into existence. I notice that several Questions have been put in the House of Commons; but it has not yet been found thoroughly possible to give a full answer to them. I would now say, in the first place, that your Lordships are well aware that for several years—for the last 12 years, we may put it—there have been from time to time very heavy and serious complaints made from different parts of the country of the depression of trade; and not only have these complaints been made in different parts of the country, but the feeling has found expression in various ways in an authoritative form. More than once, Chancellors of the Exchequer, in bringing forward their Budgets, have referred, especially within the last two or three years, to the continued depression which has such a detrimental effect upon the Revenue of the country; and Motions have been made upon the subject in the House of Commons. Under the circumstances, it seemed to the Government to be a right and proper and desirable thing that an inquiry should take place to get as far as possible at the real facts of the case, and to ascertain what this depression is, and how it is working, and what is the probable outcome of the present state of things, if nothing is done. It may also be desirable that the various suggestions that have been made for meeting and remedying the depression should be examined somewhat critically; and for that purpose the Government thought it would be desirable to appoint a Commission of rather an extended character. It is not so much a Commission for the purpose of deciding or settling upon a policy, as a Commission for the purpose of ascertaining the facts, and collating and criticizing and examining them. The decision as to what policy should be pursued is a matter for the Government of the day and for Parliament. What is now principally desired is to obtain information which may guide any Government which may be in power in the formation of a policy. Of course, for that purpose it is important that we should get the assistance of men of the most different positions and different views and opinions in the country who might in any way assist us in obtaining correct and proper information. The first object we have in view, therefore, is to discover a sufficient number of men who would be willing and able to give us assistance in that direction. I may mention that before this Commission was decided upon a very powerful and interesting speech was delivered by a man of high position —I mean Mr. Goschen—at Manchester. Mr. Goschen entered largely into the question and the condition of trade; and it did appear to me, when I undertook, at the request of my Colleagues, to take the Chair on this inquiry, that it would be very much to our advantage if we could get Mr. Goschen's assistance on the Commission. I, therefore, addressed him, before anybody else, for the purpose of consulting him upon the subject. Mr. Goschen, however, on considering the matter for a short time, replied that, for various reasons with which he need not trouble me, he could not undertake the duties of a Commissioner. That sort of answer did not encourage me to proceed much further. I proceeded, however, to draw up the best list I could of Gentlemen to be asked to serve on the Commission, and when I had drawn it up I put myself into communication with some Members of the late Government, who had taken an interest in questions of this character, and who would, I thought, be willing and able to give assistance. I was particularly anxious to get the assistance of Mr. Shaw Lefevre and Mr. J. K. Cross, the late Under Secretary of State for India. I had several communications with Mr. Shaw Lefevre and Mr. J. K. Cross; but, unfortunately, I was unable to persuade these Gentlemen to join the Commission. Mr. J. K. Cross, I am sorry to say, besides other things, was prevented by the state of his health from undertaking the task; and I was unable to persuade Mr. Shaw Lefevre that it would be safe and proper for him and some of his Friends to join in the inquiry. Mr. Shaw Lefevre did not like some of the names proposed; he did not like the appearance of the Commission; and he declined, and other Members of the late Government also declined, to join in the undertaking. I very much regret that this is the case; because, whether it is on account of the action of the Members of Her Majesty's late Government, or for any other reason, I have certainly failed to obtain the co-operation of a good many Gentlemen whom I was earnestly desirous to enlist in this cause, and who I think would have rendered good service. I do not know that I should do any harm in mentioning the names of those to whom I have applied, but who are unable to attend. They are—Sir Hussey Vivian, M.P., who on account of other engagements was unable to serve; Mr. Slagg, the Member for Manchester; Mr. Hibbert, M.P.; Mr. Goschen, M.P.; Mr. W. E. Forster, M.P.; Mr. Shaw Lefevre, M.P.; Mr. J. K. Cross, M.P.; Mr. Courtney, M.P.; and Mr. Norwood, M.P. All those Gentlemen, many of whom would be of very great advantage to us in conducting this inquiry, declined to serve on the Commission, and I am extremely sorry that it is so. However, we have gone on as well as we could in the difficult circumstances in which we were placed; and I have now, I will not say absolutely completed the list, because there are still one or two from whom I have not yet received answers, and it is not quite fair to judge of the Commission unless you give their names as a whole. Still, I think I should be doing right if I were to give the names of those who have accepted. My noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (the Earl of Dunraven) has undertaken to serve with us on the Commission. I will take the others alphabetically, though they will come in rather a miscellaneous order. First, there is Mr. Aird, who is a partner in the firm of Messrs. Lucas and Aird, who are large employers of labour, and will have the means of obtaining a great deal of information. Then comes Sir James Allport, the late general manager of the Midland Railway, whose position naturally gives him great opportunity of affording us information, and telling us where we can find the right persons to examine out of the Midland district. Then there are Mr. Lionel Cohen, who is a Gentleman of large financial knowledge; Mr. Corry, M.P., a shipowner of Belfast; Mr. Jackson, the Member for Leeds; Mr. David Dale, of Darlington, who was strongly recommended on account of his connection with the iron trade; Mr. Ecroyd, M.P. for Preston; Mr. W. Fowler, the Member for Cambridge, who has had large banking experience; Mr. Henry H. Gibbs, whom we invited on account of his financial knowledge, and on account of his services being especially valuable in connection with the possibility of the monetary question being one of those to be inquired into. We have, also, Mr. Houldsworth, the Member for Manchester (I should have taken the Liberal Member, Mr. Slagg, but find him unable to accept); Mr. Jamieson, the President of the Scotch Society of Accountants, a man who knows as much of Scotland as any man, and who rendered great services in the winding-up of the City of Glasgow Bank, has accepted the invitation; Mr. Neville Lubbock, who is connected with the sugar trade, and a brother, I believe, of Sir John Lubbock; Sir Louis Mallet—I think I may mention him as being likely to join, although he has not definitely accepted; Mr. Muntz, the Member for North Warwickshire; Mr. Arthur O'Connor, a Gentleman of great ability, as those who have seen him in the House of Commons are well aware; Mr. Pearce, of Messrs. Elder and Co., the Glasgow shipbuilders; Mr. Inglis Palgrave, who is, or was till lately, editor of *The Economist*, and has paid much attention to financial questions; Mr. C. M. Palmer, the Member for North Durham, who is a large shipowner; Professor Bonamy Price, and Mr. Storey, the Member for Sunderland. Those are the Gentlemen who have consented to serve on the Commission, and I will also endeavour to get one or two working men to join the Commission. Mr. Birtwhistle, Secretary to the Weavers' Association, will, I believe, serve, and I am endeavouring to get another. That is the position in which the Commission stands, and I have invited the Gentlemen I have named to meet me at a preliminary meeting in the course of this week in order to consider how we are going to work. I propose to lay before them a Paper which I am about to lay on the Table—it is a Memorandum upon the course of the inquiry, the objects we have in view, and the manner in which that inquiry can best be carried out. It will depend upon these Gentlemen how far it may be desirable to accept, and how far to modify, that programme. I believe, on the whole, it will be found most convenient to put out a well-selected body of questions, to have them distributed as widely as possible, and then, having received replies to those questions, and taken official evidence, we shall be much guided as to the nature of the rest of our inquiry. It seems to me there are large and important questions upon which we may easily do good work. Among others, it will be found that our information with regard to the home trade of the country is very imperfect, though our information with regard to foreign trade is tolerably good. I believe we shall be able to obtain considerable improvement as to the mode of collecting information about our home trade by the labours of the Commission. I hope the Commission will work in the spirit in which it is appointed. It is not appointed in any Party spirit to support any foregone conclusion. It is appointed for the purpose of investigating a state of things materially affecting the people of the country, which has now continued long enough to make it really a matter of importance that we should inquire how far it is possible to guide the course of events, and prevent disasters with which we are threatened. I believe we are taking the wisest course in entering boldly upon a formal, but a large and comprehensive inquiry. There is a sort of disposition in some quarters to cry out that we are interfering with the doctrines of Free Trade. What the doctrines of Free Trade or the nature of the inquiry may be—these are questions which I do not think it necessary to go into now. If these doctrines are as sound as I believe they are they will be supported, and will come well out of any inquiry which may take place, and be strengthened by it. But I do not think you will improve the position which Free Traders seem to desire to take up by declining to go into an inquiry lest it should disclose some inconvenient results. They cry "Great is Diana of the Ephesians," as if that were all that could be said, and as if we were to abstain from altering or interfering with the established state of things. I hope and trust that what I have said may be understood as intended to represent the spirit in which we shall proceed; and although we have not met with that support from our Predecessors which I think we might reasonably have expected, yet I hope we shall receive the assistance of all classes in this great national undertaking.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, believing that it is not desirable to appoint this Commission, and that it will lead to no actual or practical results, I entertain the same objections to its appointment which I expressed when the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Dunraven), who was then sitting on the Cross Benches, brought forward the subject at considerable length at an earlier period of the Session. At that time I offered what I thought was a complete and conclusive argument against the appointment of the Commission; for all that part of my speech was almost a verbatim repetition of what the late Earl of Beaconsfield said when an exactly similar Motion was raised some years ago. That noble Earl then denounced the idea of such a Commission, on the ground that it had no specific object, and that its labours were not likely to lead to any practical result. The noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Iddesleigh) has certainly not given us any definite object; on the contrary, he deprecates its having any pre-arranged objects, and says that it is merely for the purpose of collecting information. I cannot, however, quite forget the line taken up by the noble Earl opposite the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (the Earl of Dunraven). A personal and political Friend of mine said that the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury) would never consent to tax foreign manufactures. I am not quite so sure about that. As I understand the distinction, the noble Marquess would desire to tax foreign manufacturers, in order to use it as a weapon to obtain Free Trade from other countries. In that he differs from the noble Earl the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, whose view was that we should have a new commercial system by which the Revenue should gain by the taxation of foreign manufactures. Of the two I rather prefer the view of the noble Earl the Under Secretary of State, because, after all, that is a new fiscal arrangement, which has some element of certainty about it; whereas the noble Marquess's plan has this great disadvantage, that it introduces uncertainty by its very character. It would create a new vested interest in this country, protected by the temporary means it proposes, which would have to be compensated when those means were withdrawn. With regard to the practical character of the Commission, the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Iddesleigh) has mentioned a vast number of important subjects into which the Commissioners are to inquire, and I can conceive that such an Inquiry will last one or, more probably, two years. But, on the other hand, I have read in *The Standard* of this day a letter which purports to be an answer by the noble Marquess to a congratulatory Resolution from the Conservative Working Men's Association of Kirkdale. In the letter the Association is informed that Lord Salisbury trusts that when the General Election is over, it may be found that the efforts of the Conservative Government to restore peace to their country and a more healthy and prosperous condition to its trade may not have proved unsuccessful. I will not go into the question of restoring peace; but with regard to the question of restoring a more healthy and prosperous condition of trade, if the noble Marquess has got in his pocket the secret for bringing about that beneficent result in three or four months, what on earth is the use of proposing a Commission of Inquiry whose labours may probably last a year or two? No doubt, we must allow for a certain amount of laxity and latitude before an Election in the assurances given to constituencies; but if the noble Marquess can assure the working men of Kirkdale of the restoration of a more healthy and prosperous condition of trade, the position of the Government really appears to require some explanation. With regard to the composition of the Commission, the noble Earl opposite spoke with the utmost courtesy of those Gentlemen—some of them of great eminence—to whom application had been made to serve, but who had declined to do so; but yet the right hon. Baronet the Chancellor of the Exchequer, at Bath, on Saturday, made something like a direct attack upon Gentlemen who had declined to serve on the Commission, and whom he accused of something like want of patriotic conduct, and of refusing to join because they did not believe that they could maintain those economical doctrines which they had supported all their lives. For my own part, I have no business to represent Mr. Goschen; but do your Lordships—does the noble Earl opposite—really believe that Mr. Goschen is a man who in any way shirks a public duty which he thinks he can efficiently carry out, or that he is a man who, at this moment, is likely to feel utterly unable to defend those economical principles of which he is one of the strongest supporters? As to Mr. Shaw Lefevre and Mr. J. K. Cross, can either the noble Earl opposite or any of your Lordships so think of either of those Gentlemen? I have had some communications with them on this subject, and so far from their having absolutely decided not to serve on the Commission, they were very ready to consider the question whether they should do so if they were asked; but they naturally wished to know what was to be the scope of the Commission, and, what they thought to be equally important, what was to be its constitution; and I think it is a source of some anxiety to them that they find it impossible to serve. I am talking rather offhand now; but I think these Gentlemen found that the list of names which the noble Earl submitted to them included seven or eight Gentlemen professedly Fair Traders, or, as I prefer to call them, Protectionists; that the large majority of them were Conservatives; and that the rest were composed of local Gentlemen representing trade and manufacture. I am not at all surprised that they did not think that was a right Commission, or one that would commend itself to the respect and confidence of the whole country; and I think they were equally right in thinking that the burden should not be thrown upon them of defending, whether they are right or wrong, the received and acknowledged doctrines which underlie our fiscal arrangements. I think they were right in the course they took; but, if it was not so, I should like to ask the noble Earl opposite to state how many Members of the present Government were asked to serve on another Royal Commission, with a very definite object, in reference to merchant shipping and shipbuilding, and how many accepted or declined the invitation? I must repeat that I am only concerned to show that no blame whatever attaches to those Gentlemen who, after a due and confidential consideration, determined that it was no part of their public duty to go into a Commission which they very much feared would not be satisfactory, and which would not command the confidence which it was so desirable such a Commission should enjoy.

The Marquess of SALISBURY: My Lords, the speech of the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) would almost convey the idea that the question before the House was rather what my opinions were, than whether the appointments upon the Royal Commission were good. I am always much interested in and even complimented by any remarks of the noble Earl upon my opinions, although he may take objection to them; but I am bound to say I do not see what they have to do with the Royal Commission in question. I am not a Member of it, and I shall not have the slightest influence in guiding this Inquiry to its results. The noble Earl referred to something I said in a past debate. Now, it is a matter of perfect indifference to the objects of the Commission what opinions I may have expressed in some past debate. I may have expressed such an opinion as that to which the noble Earl has referred in some past debate. I do not remember it; but I gather from him that my offence in that debate was, that I recommended some measures which would have had the effect of causing a temporary increase in portions of the tariff, and, therefore, of creating a number of vested interests, and when that increase of the tariff was abandoned, those vested interests would, in some way or other, have claimed compensation. If the noble Earl is prepared to lay down, as a principle, that an increase of the tariff is always to be condemned, unless the Minister who recommends it will guarantee its permanence, I must leave him to settle his dispute with all the Ministers of Finance who have existed in this country during the present century. They have often made an increase of the tariff for a particular purpose, and with a definite, but limited, object, without any intention that the increase should be permanent. I have never before heard that such a course was condemned on account of the vested interests which might possibly arise during the temporary existence of the tariff, which it was intended ultimately to reduce. There is another quotation which the noble Earl gave, I think rather laxly, from some letter which I was supposed to have written.

EARL GRANVILLE: I have the words written here.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I do not remember the words. No doubt, what I was referring to, when I expressed a hope that the influence of the present Government might be beneficial to the recovery of trade, was the hope that the principles upon which we shall advise Her Majesty to carry on the Government would have the effect of giving that confidence abroad and at home which is the very life of prosperity and industry in this country; and, we believe, through that means, and not through any special legislative measure, very definite and real benefit may be conferred, by a new system of policy, upon the trade and industry of the country. That was the idea which I probably had in my head when I was writing the words to which the noble Earl refers. But it is really fatuous to occupy time in considering what influence my individual opinions may have upon this important Commission. I will only say a word as to what is really the main question raised before your Lordships, which is, whether we are to think that these Liberal authorities, who have come to a kind of agreement to "Boycott" this Royal Commission, have fulfilled their duty as statesmen in so doing. Of course, we could not take any one man and say it is his duty to serve upon a Commission, for he may have other engagements; but when we find a considerable number of distinguished men of the same political colour refusing to serve, and when we know, what is a matter of public notoriety, that the word was passed along not to go on the Royal Commission, I think we have a right to inquire whether such an attitude towards the inquiry is justified by principles which generally actuate English statesmen; whether it would not have been, perhaps, more patriotic if they had put into their pockets all consideration of the fact that this Commission had been set on foot by their adversaries, or contained people with whom they might not agree; and whether it would not have been better to have addressed themselves in concert with other men, not only politicians, but men of business, merchants, and manufacturers, and men of great authority, to find out whether all the sufferings our people have been going through are really unavoidable, or whether there is not in it some cause which we may discover and lay before Parliament, and for which Parliament may find a remedy. It seems to me that this is so great an object that, considering the suffering that has been undergone, and is so general, considering that the interests of this country which are jeopardized are so serious and enormous, all those petty considerations of what Party has set the Commission on foot, or as to what partizans were upon it, should have been rejected by men of the character and position alluded to by the noble Earl. I was surprised to hear the noble Earl give, as a reason for their refusal, that they found the composition of it was such that they could not serve on it with advantage. If I understood my noble Friend (the Earl of Iddesleigh) aright, I believe it is the fact that these statesmen were asked in the first instance, so that it was impossible for them to say what the composition of the Commission would be, and to give that as a reason. If, in consequence of their refusal to serve, there was a very small admixture of the Liberal element on the Commission, I cannot think that that is an argument to justify their own abstention. Is their own abstention a justification of their own abstention? The Commission does not contain a large Liberal element, because they insisted upon staying away. Then they point to the Commission, and say there are no Liberal statesmen there. I am surprised the noble Earl should adopt such an argument. The Commission contains many representative men of all descriptions, and it is a matter of regret that it does not contain Liberal statesmen to any extent. The noble Earl has stated, as some sort of reproach, that the Commission contains men connected with business in various localities. I should have thought they were the men most wanted on a Commission of this sort to investigate trade questions, and to tell us where the evil is. My Lords, I believe that the Commission is very fairly constituted. There are on it, no doubt, a certain number—a small number—of those who are connected with the opinions described as those of "Fair Trade;" there are on it some stout champions of the orthodox doctrine of Free Trade; and there are on it a considerable number of Gentlemen with regard to whom you cannot say beforehand that they have any strong or preconceived opinions, but who will give their judgment and verdict according to the facts which are brought before them. There are some of the most eminent mercantile and industrial men in the country on the Commission, and I believe that their names will attract the confidence of their countrymen, who desire that the Commission should consist, not of illustrious statesmen, but of men who are competent to examine into the matter which is referred to them, and who will give a true, a fair, and an impartial verdict, untrammelled by any preconceived opinion, on the facts laid before them; and that I believe they will do.

EARL GRANVILLE: My Lords, in explanation, I would say that the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Salisbury) has defended the one-sidedness of the Commission on the ground, among others, that Mr. Shaw Lefevre and Mr. J. K. Cross, when asked to serve upon it, refused to do so before they knew who their Colleagues would be. At that time, however, they had not refused; but they naturally wished to know what the constitution of the Commission would be, and a long list of 17 or 18 names, most of which have been just mentioned by the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Iddesleigh), was submitted to them, giving this enormous preponderance to Conservatives and Fair Traders on the Commission. The noble Marquess opposite is wrong in supposing that I spoke with contempt of the manufacturers of this country, of whom I am one; but it is the case that I have condemned the composition of the Commission as a whole; and even assuming that all the manufacturers on the Commission were neutral, there will still be an enormous preponderance of professed Fair Traders and of Conservatives upon it, for those who cannot be described as Free Traders may be assumed to come under one or other description.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (The Earl of IDDESLEIGH): I wish to make an explanation, in the first place, with regard to what the noble Earl opposite (Earl Granville) has said as to the composition of the Commission, when some of the Members of the late Government were asked to join it. They were at that time expressly told that no appointment had been made, and that no person had been spoken to on the subject, with the exception of my noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (the Earl of Dunraven). When this matter was so put before Mr. Shaw Lefevre and Mr. J. K. Cross, I explained to them, and they were told, that we had made no other arrangements, and that it was quite possible to discuss the matter freely. When the noble Earl says that all who cannot be expressly named as Free Traders are to be taken as Conservatives and Fair Traders, I do not know on what ground he makes that statement. As regards half the Members of the Commission, at least, I do not myself know at this moment whether they are Fair Traders or not. The Members of the Commission have been appointed because they can give good information as to the trade of the country. I do not know, for instance, whether Sir James Allport is a Fair Trader or not; but a man of his intelligence and experience will be of great use in an Inquiry which is to give us good information as to the facts. The noble Earl assumes that everyone who was not put on the Commission expressly for the purpose of fighting the principles of Free Trade and of cross-examining the statements on the other side, is to be reckoned as a Fair Trader. I think that is a great error, and I extremely regret it. I do not desire by these observations to throw blame upon anybody, but I wish to explain the peculiar and difficult position in which we were placed.

EARL GRANVILLE: When the noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Iddesleigh) first communicated with the two Gentlemen I have mentioned, it is no doubt true that the Members of the Commission were not actually appointed; but the noble Earl named those persons whom it was proposed to ask to join it, and I do not understand him to deny that that was so.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (The Earl of IDDESLEIGH): Yes, that was so; but they had not, either of them, been asked, and they knew nothing about it. If I had been asked to take off this Gentleman's name, for instance, and put on another, possibly I might have done so.

LORD DENMAN said, Sir James Allport was the only one of the Commission known to him, and no man had done more for the working classes; and as the Commissioners would neither be paid for their time, nor have their travelling expenses, their gratuitous investigations ought to be treated with respect, and not with icy coldness and contempt.

Memorandum for the Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry; ordered to be laid before the House.—(*The Earl of Iddesleigh.*)

Memorandum laid before the House (pursuant to Order of this day), and to be *printed.* (No. 247.)

ARMY—THE ARMY RESERVE—END OF SERVICE WITH THE COLOURS.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

THE MARQUESS OF LOTHIAN asked the Under Secretary of State for War, For what length of time it is proposed to keep the Reserve men with the Colours? After the statements which had been made in Parliament as to their relations with Foreign Powers, it did not seem at all probable that the Reserve men would be called upon for active service; and it was, therefore, very undesirable to keep them with the Colours for no definite purpose. Considerable expense was thereby caused to the country, much hardship to the families of the men, and great inconvenience, in many cases, to their Civil employers—and this especially would have the bad effect of making employers of labour hesitate in future before taking Reserve men into their service. He hoped, therefore, that the noble Earl would be able to give some assurance that these men would shortly be dismissed to their homes.

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES (The Earl of DUNRAVEN), who replied, said, he was afraid he could not give a very satisfactory answer to the Question in the absence of his noble Friend the Under Secretary of State for War. Circumstances had changed very much for the better since the Reserve men were called out; but the time when they could be dismissed depended upon all kinds of political considerations, and it was impossible to say exactly what that date would be. Her Majesty's Government fully understood the inconvenience of these men being kept from their ordinary occupations, and they would not be detained a moment longer than the neccessities of the country and the requirements of the Service demanded.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) (No 2) BILL.

(*The Marquess of Waterford.*)

(NO 235.) REPORT.

Order of the Day for receiving the Report of the Amendments read.

Moved, "That the Report be now received."—(*The Marquess of Waterford.*)

EARL FORTESCUE said, he would take advantage of that occasion to renew his protest against the further development of the original Act, which had more than verified the prediction he ventured to make as to its probable operation, founded, as it was, upon an unsound and dangerous principle, and applied to a state of society peculiarly ill-qualified at present to use it with fairness and discretion. He had predicted that it would be found generally unworkable, but, where applied, would give occasion for jobbery, favouritism, and spite.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said, he would divide the House on the Bill if he could hope for any support. So dangerous was the precedent of the Bill, that he should be anxious to divide against it by way of protest. He believed that action should be taken to prevent the dwellings of the labourers in Ireland being allowed to be in an unsanitary condition without resorting to exceptional legislation of this character. The action of the State should be negative, and not destructive. The principle of the Bill was, that some authority was to have the power to build and repair houses out of the rates, and the State was to make advances in aid of this purpose.

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD said, he must be allowed to explain that he had been misunderstood on a former occasion. The erection of houses was to be paid for out of the rates, without State aid. The Treasury was to make advances to be paid off in a certain number of years.

THE EARL OF WEMYSS said, that if the Treasury was to make advances, it could not be disputed that the State was to come forward. He therefore wished to know where the money set aside for the purposes of the Bill was to be obtained? He would also like to be informed why the same principle was not to be applied to England and Scotland? He would ask, was not the same principle capable of adoption in regard to the labourers in Scotland and England? The principle of the Bill was one that might extend very far; and in a very few months or years it might be applied not only to Ireland, but to England and Scotland, to country and to town.

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD said, that the speech which they had just listened to ought to have been made in the year 1883, when the principle of the Bill was agreed to in that House. He maintained that the Bill was a necessity, and he desired to see it passed. The Act of 1883 certainly contained what was at the time a most novel principle; but as the Act had been kept continually dangling before the eyes of the Irish people, and as it was impossible that that Act could work in its present condition, it was right to pass the Bill in order that the principle recognized by their Lordships in 1883 might not be fruitless. Even from the point of view of his noble Friend (the Earl of Wemyss) the Bill was better than its predecessor, for it was more economical in its nature, that Act having proved to be unworkable in consequence of the enormous expenditure which it entailed. He (the Marquess of Waterford) was very much in favour of improving the housing of the Irish labourers. If their Lordships had seen the houses in which many Irishmen lived, they would feel strongly on the subject. He was very anxious that the Bill should pass, for he believed it would be a great boon to the Irish labourer; and, besides, it was cheaper to lease a piece of land than to buy the fee simple of it, and the Bill would save the rates instead of increasing them.

EARL FORTESCUE said, he had not merely protested against, but had moved the rejection of, the Bill of 1883.

On Question? Their Lordships *divided*:—Contents 43; Not-Contents 5: Majority 38.

Resolved in the *affirmative.*

Report *received* accordingly.

Clause 16 (Powers of the sanitary authority relative to purchase existing cottages, and allot land to existing cottages).

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD moved an Amendment to the clause, providing that the purchases of cottages or plots of land to be put in repair for the accommodation of labourers should be "by agreement."

Amendment moved, in page 8, line 9, after ("may"), insert ("by agreement").—(*The Marquess of Waterford.*)

THE EARL OF MILLTOWN asked what provision was made for the protection of landlords? Who was to be the judge whether the cottage was in a bad state of repair or not?

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD, in reply, said, that the rules were very stringent as to the Court of Appeal. In the first instance, the Local Government Board would decide as to the adoption of the scheme when put by the local Sanitary Authority. The noble Earl, he was sure, felt confidence in the Local Government Board; but any landlord, not being satisfied, and who desired, could appeal to the Lord Lieutenant and the Privy Council. He (the Marquess of Waterford) thought that their interests were perfectly safe in the hands of the Lord Lieutenant.

EARL FORTESCUE said, that bad sanitary arrangements in towns were much more injurious than in the country. The proportion of deaths from zymotic diseases, which were due chiefly to bad sanitary conditions, was one-third less in Connaught than in Ulster or Leinster, because, though the dwellings themselves were generally much worse, they were also generally more scattered. The sanitary condition of the rural districts in Ireland was not bad, though that of the towns was very bad; neither was the death-rate nearly so high among the labourers in that country as it was amongst the operatives in the great manufacturing centres in England.

Amendment *agreed to;* words *inserted* accordingty.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 19 (Miscellaneous amendments of Act of 1883. 46 & 47 Vic. c. 60).

LORD VENTRY, who had the following Amendment upon the Paper:—In page 9, line 42, leave out from ("The") to ("time") in line 43, and insert—

("The advertisements mentioned in section seven of the Labourers (Ireland) Act, 1883, may be published in one of the months of March, April, and May,")

said, he did not intend to move it.

Amendment (by leave of the House) *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

On the Motion of The Marquess of WATERFORD, the following clause *inserted* after Clause 22:—

(Set off of rent against rates.)

"Any person indebted to a board of guardians in respect of poor rate for property situate in any union, to whom such board of guardians, in their capacity as sanitary authority, are indebted for rent for any land held by them for a term of years under this Act in that union, may set off against the sum so due by him for rates the sum due to him for rent as aforesaid."

Bill to be read 3ª *To-morrow;* and to be *printed,* as amended. (No. 245.)

CRIMINAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL.

(*The Earl Beauchamp.*)

(NO. 242.) CONSIDERATION OF COMMONS' AMENDMENTS.

THE PAYMASTER GENERAL (Earl BEAUCHAMP), in moving that the Commons' Amendments in the Bill be considered, said, that they were not nearly so formidable as they would appear to be from their bulk on the Paper of Business, a large portion of them consisting chiefly of a redrafting of the provisions. A Select Committee of their Lordships' House sat on the subject in 1881 and 1882, and took much evidence. The result was that in 1883 a Bill was brought into that House by a noble Earl not now present (the Earl of Dalhousie). A great deal of discussion took place upon it; but the circumstances of that year prevented the Bill from being considered in the House of Commons, and it was dropped. In 1884 the Bill was again introduced in their Lordships' House and passed; it was sent down to the Commons and considered in some of its stages, but failed to become law. Nearly the same Bill, the offspring of the Select Committee of 1881 and 1882, was this Session introduced a third time in their Lordships' House and was again sent down to the House of Commons, where it had been considered and returned to their Lordships with Amendments which had materially altered the scope of the measure, while, in many cases, they had undoubtedly, to a considerable degree, improved it. For instance, there was a new provision in Clause 2, that no person should be convicted upon the evidence of one person without corroboration. That was an improvement. There was also an Amendment which made drugging a misdemeanour, and another which provided that a boy under 16 on conviction might be whipped. In Clause 5 the age was raised from 12 to 13. Probably the most convenient course would be to deal with the Amendments as a whole and not *seriatim.* The variations which they made were not so great as appeared at first sight, the most important being one which raised the age of consent from 13 to 16. An attempt had been made to treat this measure as one of the rich against the poor; but that attempt, he argued, was very unjust and unfounded. Their Lordships had investigated this very painful subject, and had, on three separate occasions, sent the Bill down to the House of Commons. So far as this measure was concerned, therefore, their Lordships had done their duty with impartiality as between the rich and the poor. He (Earl Beauchamp) was not one of those who believed that, by legislation, they could do very much to influence the morals of persons, nor did he think that it would produce all the results anticipated by its sanguine promoters. It should not be forgotten that an Act of Parliament would not make those chaste and moral who were unchaste and immoral. If, however, the Bill produced all the results hoped for by those who had promoted it, no one would rejoice more sincerely than he would. He thought there was little chance of their Lordships being able to alter the decisions which had been arrived at by the House of Commons, and therefore he would urge upon them, having regard to the necessity of passing the Bill that Session, not to imperil its object by rejecting any of the

Amendments the Commons had made, but, on the contrary, to accept them *en bloc.*

Moved, "That the Commons' Amendments be considered."—(*The Earl Beauchamp.*)

LORD FITZGERALD said, he thought that their Lordships might well congratulate themselves upon the course pursued in reference to that measure, as well as being the first to initiate legislation upon the subject. For three years in succession it had been considered carefully and deliberately by their Lordships. He preferred very much the structure of the Bill as it left that House; and he found himself in great difficulty in dealing with the Amendments made by the House of Commons, because they went very far indeed, and altered the Law of Evidence in several material particulars. Some of the Amendments made by the Commons were beyond the scope of the Preamble. Others had greatly increased the severity of the Bill, and this severity was calculated to defeat the objects with which the Bill was being passed. He was told that if he moved and carried the rejection of any of the Amendments made by the Commons, he should imperil the passing of the Bill. He would not take the responsibility of doing that, because the Bill contained much that was good, and, therefore, he must content himself with protesting against the Amendments to which he objected.

EARL FORTESCUE said, he also wished to congratulate their Lordships and the present Government, as well as the country, on the Bill being within a measurable distance of becoming law; but it was desirable it should be more clearly understood that it was the result of several successive years' labour on the part of their Lordships' House, and that it was not under the pressure of popular agitation that the subject had been taken up by them—first, carefully inquired into by a Select Committee, and then legislated upon. Their Lordships, in truth, might be regarded as the pioneers of legislation on this painful subject. He would say nothing now as to the character and probable influence of the recent agitation upon it, or as to the effect which that might have had in securing the passage of the Bill through the House. He would only remind them that in 1883 and 1884 similar Bills had, after full discussion, been sent down to the House of Commons in good time, which that House, under the guidance of the late Government, had not found time even to consider in 1883, or to pass in 1884. That House, however, had found time in each of those years to pass, with the support of the late Government, a Bill against pigeon shooting, which, though he had no sympathy with that pastime, he rejoiced their Lordships had rejected as unworthy of the attention of the Imperial Parliament. Happily, this year, the House of Commons had passed no Pigeon Shooting Bill; but had passed this measure, with many alterations, some valuable, others of doubtful expediency. He had received communications from two Judges of great experience about the great danger which boys—especially of the wages class—ran of being seduced by girls older than themselves, though under 16, and then being imprisoned, or else having black mail levied upon them. He had intended to move Amendments to the Bill, but now would not risk doing so. At the same time, he must say he was not sanguine as to the results of the measure, except in protecting young girls from outrage. Wherever they found a population destitute of religious principles or moral convictions, there they were sure to have a great deal of vice and immorality, which Parliament was powerless to suppress, or even materially to restrain. The real work to be done was one much less of less of legislative than of moral reform, and that must be carried on by religious, moral, and educational agencies.

EARL GRANVILLE said, that while he did not consider all the Commons' Amendments improvements upon the Bill, he would advise the House to accept them *en bloc.* It was unfair to say that the Bill was the result of recent publications. While he thought that great credit was due to Her Majesty's Government as regarded their conduct in the matter, he must, in justice to the Home Office, say that his noble Friend (the Earl of Dalhousie) and the late Home Secretary (Sir William Harcourt)—and they were thoroughly supported in their resolve by the Members of the late Government—previously to that Government going out of Office had fully determined to carry the Bill long before the publications referred to appeared; and at that time they received but cold support from noble Lords opposite. Seeing the progress which was made with it prior to the publications referred to, he did not think it was now fair to say it was the result of it.

The Earl of MILLTOWN said, the suggestion that the Amendments should be considered and agreed to *en bloc* was one in which he would only concur because he did not wish to endanger the passing of the Bill. Many of them seemed to him objectionable, and almost all free of importance, and he thought it extremely inconvenient that their Lordships should be obliged to adopt them without any adequate consideration. He must say he had great pleasure in congratulating their Lordships upon having come to the end of this most unsavoury subject. The Bill could not be said to reflect much credit on their House of Parliament; but, to his mind, some of the Amendments in the House of Commons had improved and strengthened it. He complained of the obscenity through which they had been compelled to pass, and that boys and girls of tender years had been allowed to sell such a filthy and obscene publication under the very nose of the police, without the authorities taking any action whatever. Who were to blame for allowing that breach of the law he did not know; but, whoever it was, a very heavy responsibility rested on their shoulders. It might have been a question whether it was right or wrong to prosecute the writer or writers; but he maintained that the same power which swept from the streets the *Confessional Unmasked* and the *Fruits of Philosophy*, works which were comparatively pure to this filthy publication, should have taken action in this matter. He was afraid, however, that some of the provisions of the Bill might lead to a state of things not unlike the odious system of *Police des Mœurs* and to wholesale corruption among the Police Force. The temptations which the Bill would place in the way of the police might be greater than they could bear. He remembered that some years ago the whole of the C. Division had to be removed from one quarter of the town to another in consequence of the corruption that prevailed among its members. He hoped the streets would be made passable for decent men and women, and would no longer be flooded with obscene publications. He was glad the House of Commons had struck out the clause giving the police arbitrary power to arrest any man or woman without any complaint having been made against them. He was also glad of the additional powers that had been given against procuresses and disorderly houses where young children were harboured; but he regretted that nothing had been done to clear the streets of young prostitutes, who might accost men or boys, and induce them to become guilty of a misdemeanour, while they themselves would be liable to no charge. Such a state of things must infallibly lead to wholesale extortion, and probably to the utter ruin of many young men who would fall victims to the wiles of these girls and the wretches who would employ them for the purpose. Power should have been given to send these girls to reformatories, instead of leaving them a standing menace to the community. As to the limit of age, he would point out that England was going three years further than any other country in the world. He trusted that the Bill would produce the good results to which their Lordships looked forward; but he could not help thinking that, by making the homes of the poor brighter and more cheerful, and decency and morality more possible in those homes, they would effect more than by any Draconian legislation of this nature.

Lord MOUNT-TEMPLE said, that he could not agree with the noble Earl that the publicity given to these criminal practices had not influenced this Bill. This Bill originated in the evidence of their Lordships' Committee five years ago. That evidence, with the Report, was published under the cover of a Blue Book, which was a damper to the curiosity and interest of the public; but it awakened in those who cared for this odious subject the earnest desire for a more effective and righteous law. The Bill was launched without help from any utterance of public opinion. No breeze of public favour stiffened its sails; it got no welcome in the other House, but met with the cold shoulder. When revolting facts of horrible criminal cruelties on defenceless girls and young children were scattered widely abroad, the compassion and consciences of persons of right feeling were so roused that the Bill returned much strengthened and improved. His noble Friend (Earl Granville) had reminded them that the late Home Secretary was very anxious to have the Bill brought forward; but such was the apathy on the subject, the indifference and general dislike in the House of Commons, that for two years it was stopped. Up to the very moment when the veil was withdrawn from the public eye and they were made aware of the grossly criminal acts that were being carried on in this country, it was thought that the Bill they were consenting to was too strong. Therefore, he said, that unless that publicity had unfolded such a horrible state of things to the public at large there would have been no prospect or probability of their getting this Bill, which seemed now to meet with the approbation of all concerned. Of course, there were parts which they might find fault with; but, on the whole, according to the amount of knowledge they had of the evil, it met with the wants of the present day.

Lord BRAMWELL said, he quite concurred in the remarks that had been made by his noble and learned Friend (Lord Fitzgerald), and, like him, would not endanger the Bill by moving the rejection of any of the Amendments. At the same time, he could not refrain from saying that in his opinion it contained many questionable matters. It was undoubtedly the fact that it had its origin in the Lords' Select Committee; but he thought their Lordships could scarcely recognize their child in its present shape. Their Lordships most carefully considered the measure; but it was an unfortunate circumstance that the considerations that had influenced their Lordships in some of the conclusions to which they arrived seemed to have been lost sight of in the House of Commons. No one could say that the clause making it a misdemeanour to induce a woman by false pretences to gratify a man's wishes, had any tendency to promote chastity. Under that clause, a woman, who knew that she was about to consort unlawfully with a man, might, nevertheless, afterwards prosecute him for having obtained her consent by false representations, such as the promise of a note or sovereign which should subsequently be shown to be bad. In such a case, the woman would know that she was a party to an immoral act, and had made a bargain for the possession of her person. In their Lordships' House that clause was framed so as only to apply to cases like that of a sham marriage, in which the woman was quite innocent. He was sorry there was not time for a conference between the two Houses, in which the reasons which had induced their Lordships to take the views they had taken could be stated. There were improvements in the Bill as it stood; but there were also faults, and it was a pity there was not time to consider them.

The PAYMASTER GENERAL (Earl Beauchamp) said, as to the alteration of the age of consent, it was very remarkable that statistics showed that, while the number of marriages of persons below 16 was only about 26 in the year, those of persons above 16 might be counted by hundreds, and those of persons above 18 might be counted by thousands. It was only right that if the father, mother, master, or guardian of a girl abused their power over her, they should lose it. It had been said in the course of the debates upon the Bill that no one quitted a prison after two years' imprisonment, without being shattered in body and mind; but if the maximum punishment was two years' imprisonment, their Lordships ought not to assume that it would be always inflicted. With reference to the commission of the offence for which that punishment was assigned, had no one a word to say about the poor girl being shattered in body and mind? There was no reason to suppose that the Judges would misuse their discretion in the imposition of punishment. He was very glad that the noble Lord opposite (Lord Mount-Temple) had borne his testimony in favour of the Bill as a useful and admirable measure, and he hoped that it would do something for the punishment of those who committed outrages upon young persons.

The Bishop of WINCHESTER said, that the Bishops were interested in this question, as the natural guardians of the morals of the people. He was speaking for all his rev. Brethren, when he said that they were most anxious that the Bill should pass their Lordships' House; and he believed, whatever faults might be in the Bill, it was calculated to do a great deal of good, and it would be a great blessing to the country. It was said, truly, that you could not make people moral or chaste by Act of Parliament; but a great deal might be done to prevent things which were immoral and unchaste. Everybody who had taken any part in trying to promote morality, knew that they were met at every corner by difficulties which had been spoken of in the course of the debate. And though they could not make people moral by Act of Parliament, they could do a great deal to put obstacles, in the way of prevention, of persons, who were trying, with all their hearts and minds, to promote immorality, from succeeding in their efforts. He felt very strongly what had been said by the noble Earl (the Earl of Milltown) that the obscene literature referred to was doing an infinity of mischief—mischief which could never be undone. Nevertheless, they must all rejoice that the mind of the public had now been opened to the extraordinary evils which prevailed, and which threatened to make England, in some respects, the most degraded country in Europe. He alluded to the terrible seduction, and worse than seduction, of young children. Living in a diocese in which there were more naval and military stations than in any other part of the country, he happened to know how terrible was the condition of the streets of those places, especially in connection with this prostitution of infants. Unless they took some step to prevent the continuation of the evil, this country, which had hitherto prided itself upon being more moral than any other country in Europe, would expose itself to the taunts of the civilized world.

Motion *agreed to:* Commons' Amendments *considered*, and *agreed to.*

House adjourned at Eight o'clock,
till To-morrow, a quarter
past Four o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Monday, 10*th August*, 1885.

MINUTES.]—Public Bills—*Second Reading*—Housing of the Working Classes (England) [248]; Moveable Dwellings [239].

Committee—*Report*—Land Purchase (Ireland) [249].

PROVISIONAL ORDER BILL.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS BILL.

LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Lords' Amendments *considered.*

Colonel KING-HARMAN asked whether it was in Order to take this Bill at the time for Private Bills? It had been treated as a Public Bill in the Upper House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The Bill is a Public Bill; but it is customary to take Provisional Order Bills at this time.

Mr. SEXTON said, this Bill was a Bill to confirm Provisional Orders made by the Local Government Board of Ireland relating merely to the method of fixing the water charge between Dublin and the townships upon the basis of population. The Amendment of the Lords related to a distinct and fresh matter—namely, the allowance per head of water. He submitted that this Amendment was not within the scope of the Bill, and should not be considered by this House.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is within the competence of this House to agree or disagree with what the Lords have inserted. There is nothing on the face of the Amendment to prevent the Lords from inserting it, or of this House from discussing it.

Amendment, Clause A (As to Order being retrospective).

Mr. SEXTON: I object to this Amendment being considered without Notice.

Mr. SPEAKER: No objection can be taken to postpone it.

Mr. GRAY said, he did not propose to ask the House to give any formal opposition to this Amendment; but he wished to point out to the House that though he understood the Corporation were willing, for the sake of peace, to agree to it, still it imposed a considerable hardship upon the citizens of Dublin. For a number of years past the townships concerned in this Provisional Order had been taking a quantity of water largely in excess of the quantity for which they had contracted, or for which they had paid. They now proposed, or it was now proposed by the Lords, to introduce an Amendment specifying that the townships should not be required to pay for the water which they had got at their own request, and which they had used and not paid for. Of course, some persons had to pay the cost, and the cost must be borne by the citizens of Dublin instead of by those who had benefited by the extra supply. As this legal difficulty had arisen, he supposed it was better to allow the past to take care of itself, and so the Corporation did not object to allowing the Bill not to be retrospective.

Question, "That this House do agree with the Lords in the said Amendment," put, and *agreed to.*

Subsequent Amendment, Clause B (As to statutable supply of water).

Question proposed, "That this House do agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."

MR. WALKER said, he wished to move that the House disagree with the Lords in this Amendment under circumstances which he would describe. This Amendment altered the amount of water to be supplied by the Corporation of Dublin to the various townships surrounding the City, without making any provision for an increase in price. The amount of supply was regulated by solemn bargains, ratified by legislation, entered into between the Dublin Corporation and the townships. The circumstances under which this came before the House, which he would briefly state, were very curious. Under the Act of 1861 Dublin had its present supply of water from the Vartry, and the citizens of Dublin paid for that supply 1*s.* 3*d.* on the Goverment valuation. By various Acts of Parliament the townships—of which the Kingstown Corporation was the one which had been most prominent in opposition to the Corporation of Dublin —were entitled to a supply of 20 gallons per head of the population, the population to be from time to time determined. Unfortunately, when these Acts of Parliament came to be worked, it was found that no provision was made in them for furnishing a legal basis for determining the population, and when litigation was opened it was found legally impossible to work the clause, because the Census was not made the legal basis for ascertaining the population. Of course, they knew that the population of these places varied, not only from day to day, but from hour to hour; therefore, under existing circumstances, it was impossible to fix the number of people to whom these 20 gallons of water per head per day were to be given. Kingstown paid only 5*d.* in the pound on the valuation for its supply. The bargain was made in 1869 by Act of Parliament; but in 1874 the Corporation of Dublin, being willing to supply the townships with an excess of water over and above 20 gallons per head on the reasonable terms of their paying for it, a Provisional Order was passed, which was ratified by an Act of Parliament, declaring that it should be lawful for the Dublin Corporation, instead of supplying merely the 20 gallons per head per day which they were obliged by the existing Statutes to give, to allow the Commissioners of the townships to draw water in excess at a price to be fixed, which was, in the case of Kingstown, 3½*d.* per 1,000 gallons. But there was no legal method of satisfactorily determining what was excess, seeing that there was no legal means of estimating the population. After some time the Corporation of Kingstown resisted the claim for excess water, and an action was brought against them by the Corporation of Dublin in order to recover the price which the township had agreed to pay for that excess. The action, in which he (Mr. Walker) happened to be counsel, failed, and failed naturally, because the population of Kingstown could not be legally ascertained, the Census not having been made, as it ought to have been, the basis for estimating the population. The township took advantage of that, and did not pay for the excess water that, under the Act of 1874, they were obliged to pay for; and on that breakdown appearing in the machinery of the Act, the Dublin Corporation applied to the Local Government Board to amend the Provisional Order of 1874 by furnishing a legal basis by which the population should be ascertained—namely, the Census of 1881, and giving also considerable advantages to the townships, because they proposed that the increment of population in the previous decade should be taken into account, and, further, that in the case of seaside resorts like Kingstown, a further allowance should be made for the summer population. This was a natural and fair course, and one would have imagined that the Kingstown Corporation would have been glad to fall in with it. However, they tried to stop this application to the Local Government Board for this Provisional Order, and brought the matter before the Court of Exchequer and the Court of Appeal, and in each case were beaten. The Local Government Board, after the fullest inquiry, and after hearing all the evidence on both sides, made the Provisional Order which it was the object of the Act of Parliament to confirm. It passed this House, after full inquiry which lasted three days, without opposition, and went up to the House of Lords. Before the Select Committee of the House of Lords the same objection was taken which had been raised before the House of Commons' Committee. A Member of the House of Lords' Committee proposed an Amendment substantially the same as the Amendment now before the House. That Amendment was opposed by the Corporation, and was not accepted. From the Select Committee it was passed to the Committee of the House of Lords itself, where a proposal of precisely the same character as that Amendment was moved and negatived by a majority of 1—20 votes to 19. On the next day, however, it appeared that the matter was again brought forward, and the numbers reversed—21 voting for the Amendment and 19 against it. Under all these circumstances, the matter now came before the House of Commons, and he felt justified in asking it to disagree to the Amendment. The Amendment was not germane to the Provisional Order—which really purported to supply a legal basis for ascertaining what the Census was—it would alter without notice the solemn compact entered into by the townships and the Corporation, and ratified by legislation; and it would impose heavy charges on the Corporation of Dublin by compelling them to supply gratuitously a quantity of water which had cost them a great deal of money. The clause was not germane to the subject-matter of the Bill upon which it had been engrafted. The object of the Bill was to provide a basis for settling the local rates between the townships. It was said in "another place" that the supply to Dublin itself was much larger than that to these townships per head of population; but then they paid a much higher price for it. Those who were acquainted with the subject the best, water engineers, said the reason why Kingstown could not do with the supply of 20 gallons per head per day was because there was much waste in the system of supply. For the reasons he had given he hoped the House would disagree with the Amendment.

Motion made, and Question, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Walker.*)

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, he did not think the hon. and learned Gentleman had put the case quite fairly to the House; he had rather slurred over the action in regard to the Bill in Committee in "another place." He had spoken as if on the very slightest opposition this clause the House was now debating was rejected; whereas the fact of the matter was that, after several hours' consideration, the Committee were unanimous in opinion that such a clause should be inserted, but, owing to some difficulty betwen counsel as to the terms of the Amendment, the matter was allowed to drop. In the House of Lords the Amendment was rejected by a majority of 1, and on a later stage of the Bill, on the Motion of Lord Fitzgerald, the clause was inserted, being carried on a division by a majority of 2 in a not very full House. It was a matter of no very great expense to the Dublin Corporation, but of great importance to the townships concerned; in these times a full water supply was a matter of great urgency and importance. Everyone must allow that 20 gallons per head to an important and rising township was an exceedingly small supply, and to increase that to 25 gallons seemed to him almost a matter of necessity. He had not had an opportunity of inquiring into the usual supply in large towns; but wherever he had obtained the information he found that the proportion was never less than 30 gallons. In Dublin it was 38 gallons, whereas the Dublin Corporation only proposed to allow to these townships the wretched amount of 20 gallons. It really seemed scarcely worth while for the Corporation to fight this matter of five gallons per head. The townships, however, looked upon it as a matter of great importance;

their population was increasing, and their houses increasing in valuation and numbers year by year. When it was said that the citizens of Dublin paid a higher rate, it should also be stated that in 1909 the citizens of Dublin would cease to pay anything at all; whereas the rate now imposed on the townships would attach to them perpetually. It seemed to him the best thing the Corporation could do would be to allow this Amendment to pass; and the next best thing to that would be to allow this Provisional Order to drop altogether, and next year to bring in a full and sufficent Bill settling the basis of water supply for the county.

THE CHAIRMAN OF WAYS AND MEANS (Sir ARTHUR OTWAY) said, he felt it his duty to advise the House to disagree with the Amendment. The matter had been so fully described by his hon. and learned Friend the late Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Walker) that it was unnecessary for him to go into the facts. He only wished to correct two particulars—one in the statement of the hon. and gallant Member for Dublin County (Colonel King-Harman), and in a small degree one statement by the late Attorney General for Ireland. As a matter of fact, there was no Motion made in Select Committee of the House of Lords on this question. What happened was this. One of the Members of the Committee—the Duke of Marlborough, he believed—being of opinion that the supply might be increased, made a suggestion to that effect; but so much objection was found that the Bill would probably have been withdrawn had the suggestion been adopted, and it was withdrawn; it was not moved in Committee. Then the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel King-Harman) spoke of the miserable allowance of 20 gallons per head; but that was the usual quantity in matters of this kind—25 gallons was quite an exceptional quantity. Further, he had to say that if the House did not reject the clause, the greatest possible confusion would be occasioned. It would necessitate the amendment of no less than eight Acts of Parliament, and interfere with a great number of contracts. The circumstances under which the clause was introduced in "another place" had been detailed by his hon. and learned Friend—how it was rejected by a very narrow majority, whose decision was upset by another narrow majority the next day. He could fully bear out the statement of his hon. and learned Friend as to the great confusion that must ensue if the clause remained, and he joined in asking the House to disagree with the Amendment.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE) said, he concurred in the view just expressed. Not entering into the controversial matter, it seemed to him the action taken might become a dangerous precedent for tacking on to a Provisional Order, passed through Committee on a very narrow issue, a clause which, if not amounting to a breach of contract, at all events would be a re-opening of all contracts. For that reason, he should vote for disagreeing with the Lords' Amendment.

Motion *agreed to.*

Clause *disagreed to.*

Committee *appointed,* "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to the Amendment to which this House hath disagreed:"—Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND, Sir HENRY HOLLAND, Mr. DALRYMPLE, Mr. DWYER GRAY, Mr. MAURICE BROOKS, Mr. Alderman MEAGHER, and Mr. SULLIVAN:—To withdraw immediately:—Three to be the quorum.

QUESTIONS.

——o——

CENTRAL ASIA—RUSSIA AND AFGHANISTAN—THE "PENJDEH INCIDENT"—ARBITRATION.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL gave Notice that he would ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the present Government adhered to the policy of the late Government in regard to the settlement by arbitration of the dispute between this country and Russia arising out of the Penjdeh incident?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I have already informed the hon. Member, in reply to a former Question, that I shall not be in a position to give to the House any further information on this subject before the adjournment.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL: Do I understand the right hon. Gentleman that he will not be able to answer this simple Question, whether Her Majesty's Government——["Order, order!"]

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) —THE CLERK OF THE PEACE, SLIGO CO.

MR. SEXTON: With respect to the promise given by the Attorney General for Ireland to inquire into the conduct of the Clerk of the Peace for the county of Sligo, I would ask the right hon. and learned Gentleman, Whether it has come to his knowledge that the Parliamentary lists were not posted until the 7th instant, three days after it was possible for persons to lodge claims?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES): No, Sir, it has not come to my knowledge; but since I gave the undertaking to the House, I have taken steps for the fullest inquiry into the matters connected with the Clerk of the Peace for the county of Sligo.

CEYLON—LIGHTHOUSES—THE BASSES LIGHTS, MINICOY LIGHTHOUSE.

MR. SUTHERLAND asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, If the dues levied on shipping on account of the Basses Lights amount in round figures to £17,000 per annum, while the cost of maintenance, including interest and repayment of loans, is little more than £10,000; and, whether there is a considerable balance in hand on this account derived from this surplus revenue; and, if so, under these circumstances, the time has arrived to reduce considerably the dues payable by shipping for the maintenance of these lights?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS): The figures stated in the Question are practically accurate for the year 1882-3; but in the 1883-4 the receipts had increased to upwards of £20,000, and the expenditure amounted to £26,000, nearly £14,000 having been provided from surplus dues towards the cost of the construction of a new lighthouse on Minicoy Island, and the balance being thus reduced to less than £6,000. Since that date the balance has increased; but, having regard to the hazardous nature of the service of attending and relieving the lighthouses—one tender having been lost —the Board of Trade think it desirable that a small reserve fund to meet contingencies should be maintained. The Board of Trade are under pledges to the Indian Government to reconsider the present rates at the earliest possible moment; but it must be borne in mind that, as the dues are held as security by the Public Works Loan Commissioners for advances remaining unpaid to the extent of nearly £106,000, the Board will not be in a position to propose a reduction in the tolls until they have gained more experience as to the revenue to be derived from the new dues for Minicoy Lighthouse and the cost of its maintenance.

EGYPT—LIGHT DUES.

MR. SUTHERLAND asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether he is aware that a representation has recently been made by shipowners of all Nationalities trading to Egypt to their several Ministers in that Country, with respect to the Light Dues at present levied by the Egyptian Government; whether the Revenue derived from these Dues amounts to a figure between £80,000 and £90,000 per annum, while the Expenditure, allowing a liberal amount to be set aside for depreciation and maintenance, does not reach anything like half that sum; whether, also, it is the case that Great Britain only acceded to the present tariff on the express condition—

> "That such tariff should be increased or lowered according to the state of the Light House Budget, to be drawn up by Government every year;"

and, if the facts as stated in this Question be correct, Her Majesty's Government will insist on the Dues on Shipping being diminished, in proportion to the excess of Revenue now obtained; or, in other words, to the extent of less than one-half the present tariff?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD (Baron HENRY DE WORMS): I am aware, Sir, that a representation to the effect stated by the hon. Member has recently been made with respect to the light dues levied by the Egyptian Government. From the Lighthouse Accounts submitted, the receipts and expenditure are practically as stated. The annual balance on the accounts is devoted to the repayment to the Egyptian Government of the debt on the lighthouse funds for the first cost of the works. In the notice issued to the shipping interest in

1870, announcing the lighthouse tariff, it was stated that the dues should be susceptible of increase or diminution according to the state of the Lighthouse Budget to be published every year. This arrangement was approved by Her Majesty's Government. As regards the fourth point, I may state that the trade have long been pressing for additional lighthouses, and any question with respect to the reduction of lighthouse dues shall be fully considered in connection with that subject.

MR. SUTHERLAND asked whether the hon. Gentleman was aware that the annual Lighthouse Budget had not been recently published by the Egyptian Government?

THE SECRETARY TO THE BOARD: I believe the hon. Member is perfectly correct; but in future that Budget will be regularly published.

LAW AND JUSTICE (IRELAND)—THE BAILIFF TO THE SHERIFF OF MEATH CO.

MR. BIGGAR (for Mr. SHEIL) asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he is aware that a man named Mathews, who is bailiff and auctioneer to the Sheriff of Meath, and as his representative makes seizures and conducts sales, was charged at the Navan Petty Sessions, of the 11th instant, with being drunk and disorderly on three occasions; that, for several years past, he has been repeatedly convicted of similar offences, and sentenced to imprisonment and fine; that, about four weeks ago, the police took a gun from him when he was rolling through the streets of Navan in a state of drunkenness; and, whether he will make such representations as will secure his dismissal from the responsible position of bailiff?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): The hon. Member is, of course, aware that a Sheriff's bailiff is not an officer of the Government, and that the Government have no power to dismiss him. It is, however, quite open to the Government, or to anyone else, to make representations in the proper quarter in case of misconduct by an officer of the law, and the Report I have received of the present case would appear to justify such representation being made. If I find, therefore, that the Sheriff has not been made aware of the facts of this case, I will see that he is communicated with.

PARLIAMENTARY VOTERS—REGISTRATION OF VOTERS IN AGRICULTURAL DISTRICTS.

MR. PICTON (for Mr. LABOUCHERE) asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he is aware that in numerous agricultural districts the overseers are throwing obstacles in the way of persons being placed on the Registry of Parliamentary Voters, and that in some places, notably at Newmarket, no list has been placed on the church or chapel doors; and, whether he will take steps to see that the overseers do their duty in the matter?

MR. BROADHURST said, that he had received a letter that day stating that complaints were made in the Thetford district also on this subject.

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR): I have no information that overseers in agricultural districts are throwing obstacles in the way of persons being placed on the Registry of Parliamentary Voters. The overseers are in no way subject to the directions of the Local Government Board with regard to their registration duties. If they fail to comply with the statutory requirements they render themselves liable to a penalty. As regards Newmarket, which is referred to, I have communicated with the overseers. One of the overseers of All Saints', Newmarket, replies—

> "Previous to August 1 a written list of voters was placed on the church door; but I believe that for some days there was no notice on the chapel door in consequence of a delay of the printers. There is now a list on both church and chapel doors. I may mention that the overseer appointed with me is an attendant at chapel and a Liberal in politics."

MR. JESSE COLLINGS asked whether, in view of the fact that this was practically new work, the President of the Local Government Board would address to the overseers a Memorandum pointing out the necessity of accuracy in making out these lists? In many parts, particularly in Suffolk, the overseers had made out those lists, and had not observed accuracy in the qualifications.

THE PRESIDENT said, he was not aware that the work was new in any special sense. It was always the duty of the overseers to place the lists on the church doors.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS asked the Home Secretary, whether he would give the Revising Barristers the largest latitude in the revision of the lists, and instruct them to be strict in the enforcement of the penalties against overseers?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): I have no power in the matter.

LAW AND POLICE—POLITICAL CLUBS.

MR. M'LAREN asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he can now carry out the promise of his Predecessor in Office respecting the late riotous proceedings at the Political Club near Tottenham Court Road, and give any explanation of the action of the Police on that occasion; why no evidence was tendered by the Police against the members of the Club on the occasion when the case against the Club was dismissed by the magistrate, and why and on what terms the Club withdrew their case against the police; and, if, considering the interest that is felt in this case among Working Men's Clubs, he will institute an inquiry into the whole matter?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS), in reply, said, he did not know what the hon. and learned Member meant by the promise of his Predecessor in Office. All that he knew was that a number of men were committed for trial by Mr. Newton on charges of assaulting the police; that there was also a cross-summons taken out against the police officers; that when the matter came before the Central Criminal Court, on the opening address of counsel being concluded, the Recorder suggested that no evidence should be offered on either side; and that that course was agreed upon, and the jury returned a verdict of "Not Guilty." There seemed to have been a misunderstanding at the time the alleged assaults occurred. The police thought they were attacking the Club, and they were not.

MR. M'LAREN asked whether, in order to prevent such misunderstandings in future, the right hon. Gentleman would not institute some kind of inquiry?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE believed that the Recorder was a Judge of very great experience, and that it was not necessary to institute any further inquiry.

SLAVE TRAFFIC—ANGLO-EGYPTIAN CONVENTION OF 1877.

SIR ROBERT FOWLER (LORD MAYOR) asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether Her Majesty's Government have taken or are taking any steps to insure the carrying out, by the Egyptian Government, of the terms of the Anglo-Egyptian Convention of 1877, for the suppression of the slave traffic, which should have come into force in August 1884?

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. BOURKE): The steps taken last year for carrying into effect the Convention of 1877 will be found in the Paper laid as Slave Trade No. 4 of 1884. Those Papers carry the Correspondence down to November last. The policy of Her Majesty's present Government will be directed towards promoting measures to bring offenders against the law before the competent tribunals.

COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—ERECTION OF NEW SCHOOLS—BUILDING MATERIALS.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it has come to his knowledge that the official specifications supplied by the Commissioners of National Education to managers applying for grants towards the erection of new schools require that all cement used in the buildings shall be of London make; whether he is aware that cement of a very superior quality is manufactured at Wexford which would be excluded by this specification; and, whether instructions will be issued to the Department to alter the specification so as not to make it prohibitory with regard to Irish-made materials?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): I understand that in a form of specification for school buildings issued by the Board of Works the use of cement of London make is recommended, but that it has never been enforced. The Board of Works inform me that when shortly issuing a reprint of this specification it is their intention to expunge the recommendation referred to.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—FINES FOR DANGEROUS USE OF FIREWORKS AT BALLINROBE.

Mr. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, at a recent sitting of the Ballinrobe Petty Sessions, some small boys, on the prosecution of the district inspector of Constabulary, were fined for having let off rockets on the occasion of a public welcome in the town to the Catholic Archbishop of the see; whether anyone was fined or prosecuted for a similar cause in any other part of the diocese; whether the district inspector, the head constable, and all the sergeants in Ballinrobe are Protestants; and, whether, the population being almost wholly Catholic, the condition of the local force in the respect specified will be amended?

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Sir William Hart Dyke): I am informed that the ages of the small boys referred to varied from 20 to 40 years. They were engaged in throwing lighted balls of tow, saturated with paraffin oil, in the vicinity of thatched houses. Complaints were made to the police of the danger of this practice, and the men were cautioned; but, as they would not desist, they were summoned and fined. There is no report of any similar prosecution in that diocese. I understand the religious composition of the force at Ballinrobe at the present moment is as stated in the Question; but there is nothing in the facts I have detailed to show that the action of the police in the present case was influenced by motives of religion. However, the Inspector General will endeavour, when an opportunity offers, to modify the present religious proportion.

PUBLIC MEETINGS (IRELAND)—THE MEETING AT DROMORE, 1883—DEATH OF —— GIFFEN.

Mr. MACARTNEY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Government, having consented to an inquiry into the Maamtrasna trial, will also institute an inquiry into the circumstances of the death of the young man Giffen, who was stabbed to death in the back while running away from a body of pursuing Constabulary in the Autumn of 1883, at Dromore, in the county of Tyrone?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): The Lord Lieutenant, in undertaking to consider any Memorials presented on behalf of persons undergoing punishment for the Maamtrasna murder, only followed the usual course with regard to such Memorial. The case of Giffen in no way resembled the Maamtrasna case, there being no person undergoing punishment. The present Government concur in the view of the late Government, that it was not necessary to have any public investigation into the death of Giffen beyond that held at the inquest.

SCIENCE AND ART DEPARTMENT, IRELAND.

Mr. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland have, in numerous instances, prevented duly qualified teachers from forming classes under the Science and Art Department, although such classes were to be taught outside school hours, and in premises obtained for the purpose; whether it is the fact that no corresponding prohibition is imposed on a teacher in Great Britain; and, whether the Irish Commissioners, while refusing to allow teachers to form evening science classes, allow them to give private tuition, to keep shops, and to cultivate farms?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): The Commissioners of National Education never prevent a teacher who discharges his duties to the pupils of his school with a fair degree of efficiency from forming classes and earning results fees under the Science and Art Department.

MERCANTILE MARINE—PILOTS—TEST OF COLOUR-BLINDNESS.

Mr. J. G. TALBOT asked the Secretary to the Board of Trade, Whether the Board will consider the advisability of extending to pilots the obligation to pass an examination as a test of colour-blindness, which is now binding upon other officers of the Mercantile Marine?

The SECRETARY to the BOARD (Baron Henry De Worms): I quite recognize the extreme importance of the question. The Board of Trade have no statutory powers to extend the examination in colours to pilots. The Parliamentary Paper, No. C. 4353, however, shows that the Board have done their best to induce pilotage authorities to apply the colour test to pilots, and that their efforts have been attended with some success in many cases. The endeavours of the Board of Trade will not be discontinued as opportunities occur from time to time to induce all pilotage authorities to include in their examinations of pilots so obvious and necessary a test.

PUBLIC HEALTH (METROPOLIS)—PURIFICATION OF THE THAMES.

MR. BORLASE asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he can give the House any information relative to the success or otherwise of the experiments which have now for some considerable time been carried on at considerable cost at Crossness with a view to the purification of the sewage of the Thames?

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR): We have been in communication with the Metropolitan Board of Works, and are informed that experiments as to the purification of the sewage discharged into the Thames at Crossness have been in progress for some months upon 1,000,000 gallons per day, and that the experiments, so far as they have gone, are considered by the officials of the Metropolitan Board of Works to have been sufficiently satisfactory to justify the Board in preparing machinery and plant for treating chemically and by precipitation 8,000,000 gallons of sewage daily. I may add that the Local Government Board have no jurisdiction as regards the discharge into the Thames of the sewage of the Metropolis.

ENDOWED SCHOOLS — ALDERMAN DAUNTSEY'S CHARITY (WEST LAVINGTON).

MR. ACLAND, referring to a recent speech of the right hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), said, it was with no disrespect to his right hon. Friend that he put the following Question; but as he thought it desirable that some official contradiction should be given to the statement contained in the speech by the official head of the Charity Commission in the House, he begged to ask the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether it is the case that there is a great endowment left for the poor of a parish in Wiltshire (which might now be used to promote their happiness and welfare), but the greater part of which is to be diverted under a scheme of the Charity Commissioners, in order to create a school of secondary education for the middle class in a neighbouring town; and, if so, whether the Government intend to take any steps in the matter?

MR. JESSE COLLINGS asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether it is the case that Alderman Dauntsey left certain properties situated in the City of London to the poor of West Lavington and the adjacent parishes for their benefit for ever; whether this property now realises about £15,000 per annum, and is in the hands of the Mercers' Company; whether about £700 only have hitherto been spent on the poor of West Lavington in the form of Free Schools and Almshouses, and that the Mercers' Company have now agreed to pay to the Charity Commissioners £30,000 on account of the property named; and, whether, under the new scheme of the Charity Commissioners, the existing Free Schools are to be taken away from the poor of West Lavington, and the £30,000 to be given to the town of Marlborough or Devizes for the purpose of establishing a school for the middle and wealthier classes?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Mr. E. STANHOPE): It is understood that the endowment referred to in the Question of the hon. Member for East Cornwall is that of Alderman Dauntsey in the parish of West Lavington. The foundation is for a grammar school and an almshouse, for the joint maintenance of which there is an annual endowment of £60 a-year. The almshouse is for poor men and women, primarily of the parish of West Lavington. The grammar school endowment was not left for the poor of West Lavington, or for the poor at all, but is entirely free from restrictive trusts, except only that the school was to be placed in West Lavington. Under the scheme of the Charity Commissioners the endowment will, by the bounty of the Mercers' Company, be largely augmented. The almshouses for the poor of West Lavington will be retained, with a sufficient annual income for their support. The school in West Lavington will be re-modelled and greatly improved, and a large sum remaining over out of the moneys provided by the Mercers' Company will be applicable elsewhere for the purpose of secondary education, which appears to have been the kind of education contemplated by the founder. The statement, therefore, which is quoted in the Question is quite inaccurate.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: I should like to ask whether it is not the fact that the original endowment, so far as the grammar school was concerned, was not for a free school, and therefore primarily a school for the poor?

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS asked, whether the right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council had read the will of Alderman Dauntsey? He should like to ask whether it was not the fact that the property, which was now supposed to be worth £150,000, had been offered by the Charity Commissioners to the Mercers' Company on condition that they should pay £30,000; and, whether it was not the fact that two-thirds of this money were to be applied to schools in a large town in Wiltshire to the detriment of the village of West Lavington?

The VICE PRESIDENT said, he had not had an opportunity of examining Alderman Dauntsey's will; but he derived his information from those who, no doubt, had referred to it. The hon. Member was entirely in error with regard to the position of the Mercers' Company as to this fund. The Court of Chancery had decided that this was not charity property at all; but as an act of grace the Mercers' Company had offered to give up large sums to be used for the purposes of this will. He had no doubt the hon. Member was right in saying that £18,000 was to be devoted to secondary education apart from West Lavington.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN: The right hon. Gentleman the Vice President of the Council has not answered my Question whether a grammar school was not a free school?

The VICE PRESIDENT said, that this was not expressly declared to be a free school, and judging from the terms of the Trust it did not appear that it was exclusively intended for the poor. The intention was to found a school somewhat above that, and to give a higher education.

PUBLIC HEALTH (METROPOLIS)—PURIFICATION OF THE THAMES. (CANVEY ISLAND).

Mr. CLARE READ asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, in view of the approach of cholera, and the desirability of appeasing the public mind as to the increasing pollution of the Thames, If he would state whether he had laid before the Metropolitan Board the memorial of Colonel Jones, V.C., and Mr. Bailey-Denton, proposing the cleansing of the Metropolitan sewage on Canvey Island, in consonance with the views of the Royal Commission on Metropolitan Sewage Discharge—viz.

> "That it is neither necessary nor justifiable to discharge the Sewage of the Metropolis in its crude state into any part of the estuary of the Thames from the Nore upwards;"

and that "the sewage liquid, after separation from the solids," should be carried down to a point of the Thames lower than Hole Haven?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross): Yes, Sir; I have some time ago.

AFRICA (WEST COAST)—GERMAN ANNEXATIONS.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD asked the Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, Whether he has any official information with reference to the reputed annexations by the German Government in the region of Zanzibar?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE (Mr. Bourke): The information received by Her Majesty's Government from Zanzibar does not confirm the truth of the statement of *The Times*' Berlin telegram of August 7 respecting the cession of the district of Kilima-Njaro, Chaga, Aruscha, &c. to the German East African Society. On the contrary, we have every reason to believe that the Chiefs of those districts are loyal to the Sultan of Zanzibar, and continue to acknowledge his suzerainty.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD asked if the right hon. Gentleman had any information as to the alleged intimidation of the Sultan of Zanzibar by the presence of a German Fleet?

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE: We have heard that the ships of the German Fleet have arrived near Zanzibar; but we have not heard whether the Sultan is intimidated.

ARMY—THE COMMISSARIAT STAFF—THE ROYAL MARINES.

SIR JOHN HAY asked the Secretary to the Admiralty, Whether Her Majesty's Government have made arrangements which will render Officers of the Royal Marine eligible to be transferred as Probationers to the Commissariat Staff; and, if so, how soon this regulation will take effect?

THE SECRETARY (Mr. RITCHIE) said that, in reply to representations from the Admiralty, the Secretary of State for War had approved a limited number of officers of the Royal Marines being transferred as Probationers to the Commissariat Staff under the same requirements as to age which existed with regard to the Army.

ARMY—ALLEGED UNPOPULARITY.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether his attention has been called to a statement in *The Pall Mall Gazette* of Friday August 7th, headed "Why the Army is unpopular," and purporting to be a letter from a private soldier at the depôt of the Royal Fusiliers at Hounslow, bringing forward a series of charges, if true, of a most serious character with regard to the treatment of recruits at that depôt; and, whether there is any foundation for such a statement with regard to any of the charges contained in that letter?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): Yes, Sir; I have noticed the article in *The Pall Mall Gazette*, and have already called for a full Report upon the depôt at Hounslow. The statements made, which refer to the month of May, are much exaggerated; but it is impossible within the limits of an answer to refute all the charges put forward. If, however, my hon. and gallant Friend will call on me at the War Office I will gladly show him the Report I have received on the subject; or if he will move for the Papers they shall be given.

ARMY — MILITARY FARMS AT ALDERSHOT.

SIR ARTHUR HAYTER asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether the experiment of farming the land at Aldershot, in the vicinity of the Commandant's quarters, has been attended with satisfactory results; and, whether the Commanding Royal Engineer at that station has been able to furnish the promised estimate per acre of the expense of reclaiming the land, after deducting the price of the manure now furnished from the camp, and the probable selling value of the crop?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): The Commanding Royal Engineer has made the following statement:—

> "Cost of reclaiming land is £30 per acre, exclusive of manure. Where drainage is necessary, cost is about £40 per acre. The annual income varies; it is now about 2 per cent on outlay, exclusive of manure, being let for grazing only. When laid up for hay, and the troops kept off, 7 and 8 per cent have been realized, exclusive of cost of manure. Value of manure furnished from the camp is about £15 per acre."

THE IRISH LAND COMMISSION—THE APPEAL COURT—APPEALS FROM TENANTS ON LORD ROSSE'S ESTATE, PARSONSTOWN.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, How it happened that, out of thirty-four appeals to the Irish Land Commission, in the cases of tenants on Lord Rosse's estate in the union of Parsonstown, only four were listed for hearing in Dublin on the 3rd ultimo, and, after these four tenants had come eighty miles, with their solicitors and valuers, and waited two days in Dublin to have their cases heard, the cases were put back to a future day; why the Land Commission did not fix a time for hearing all the cases on the estate, so as to render the costs less oppressive to the individual tenant; and, whether arrangements will be made to save the tenants from avoidable costs by a local hearing of their cases?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): There were no land appeals listed for hearing on the 3rd ultimo. Four cases on Lord Rosse's estate were listed for hearing with several others on the 4th of June. On that day it was stated to the Court that three of Lord Rosse's cases had been settled, but none of them were actually reached on that day, and not having been formally withdrawn, they were re-listed for the 17th of June, when the one case not settled was dismissed, and the other three were withdrawn, with costs to the tenants. The Land Commissioners inform me that it is not practicable for them to hold a Court of Appeal in every county in Ireland; but in making their arrangements they consult, as far as possible, the convenience of suitors.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY—CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMISSION.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD: I beg to put a Question to the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer in reference to his speech at Bristol on Saturday. I desire to ask the right hon. Gentleman, Whether he is correctly reported to have said, with reference to the proposed Royal Commission on Depression in Trade—

> "Right hon. and hon. Members of the Opposition have seemed to shrink from serving on this Commission because they appear to imagine that those doctrines may be questioned, and, as it were, to doubt their power of defending them. We desire, in the name of the nation, the help of our political adversaries in this matter, and if they do not give it they will be wanting in their duty to their country and their Queen."

I wish, Sir, to ask whether the Chancellor of the Exchequer is thus correctly reported; and, further, if he will lay on the Table of this House the Correspondence which has passed between the Earl of Iddesleigh and those right hon. and hon. Members of the Opposition, in order that it may be seen what was the numerical position in which the Earl of Iddesleigh desired to place those who defend the economic doctrines which have governed this country for a generation or more. [*Cries of* "Oh!" *and* "Order!"]

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The Notice of the hon. Member's Question was only placed in my hands as I entered the House, and therefore I have had no opportunity of referring to any report of the remarks which I made at Bristol. But I think the quotation of the hon. Member accurately represents the purport of what I said, with this exception—that I did not, so far as I recollect, go as far as to say "that they will be wanting in their duty to their country and their Queen." What I said was, I think, an expression of my own belief that service on such a Commission as this, if required, was a duty which those who had been invited to serve owed to their country. With regard to the Question of the hon. Member as to the Correspondence between the Earl of Iddesleigh and the right hon. Gentleman opposite (Mr. Shaw Lefevre), it is, of course, of a nature which prevents my laying it on the Table.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: As one of those concerned in this matter, having been invited to take part in this Commission, I venture to hope that the right hon. Gentleman will lay before the House the Correspondence which has passed between myself and the Earl of Iddesleigh. [An hon. Member: Move for it.] I shall take an opportunity, if Her Majesty's Government decline to lay it on the Table, of producing it in some other way; and I venture to think that when published it will not bear out the remarks of the right hon. Gentleman. [*Cries of* "Order!"]

Mr. SPEAKER: The matter cannot be debated at this stage.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: I beg to give Notice that I will to-morrow ask the right hon. Gentleman whether, with the consent of myself, he will lay the Correspondence before the House?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: There are two parties to this Correspondence—the Earl of Iddesleigh and the right hon. Gentleman; and, of course, I cannot make a promise without consulting with the Earl of Iddesleigh.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD: The right hon. Gentleman will have an opportunity of consulting the Earl of Iddesleigh to-day; and, therefore, I beg to give Notice that I will ask him to-morrow whether he will present the Correspondence?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I shall be happy to answer the Question, Sir, if asked by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre).

EDUCATION OF THE BLIND—THE ROYAL COMMISSION.

Sir GABRIEL GOLDNEY asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether numerous remonstrances had not been received upon the composition of the Commission lately issued with regard to the education of the blind, on the ground that a preponderant number of the Commission were the representatives and advocates of one particular system, while other systems were wholly unrepresented; and, whether he would consider the expediency of increasing the number of the Commission by the addition of representatives of other methods of teaching, in order that the Commission might be so constituted as that its Report when issued might command the confidence of the public?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross), in reply, said, that the Royal Commission on the Education of the Blind had been appointed by the late Government, and it was an accident that the arrangements were not completed when they left Office. He had added two additional Members to the Commission; and he would consider the advisability of appointing a Member from Ireland.

THE REGISTRATION (SUPPLEMENTARY) LISTS.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he would issue instructions to Clerks of the Peace and to Town Clerks of boroughs with respect to their new duties in connection with making out the supplementary lists of voters which should contain the names of voters who would otherwise be removed as disqualified?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross), in reply, said, he had been informed that the Home Office had already sent out Circulars about registration.

Mr. CLARE READ asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he would issue a Circular to Boards of Guardians directing them to afford the overseers such assistance as would enable them to prepare the supplementary lists of voters consequent on the passing of the Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Act?

The PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. Balfour), in reply, said, that relieving officers were bound by law to furnish all the information in their power. He had no power to give any directions in the matter; but no complaint had reached him of any information having been withheld by any Board of Guardians.

PARLIAMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

The Marquess of HARTINGTON: I should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he can make any statement to-day as to what Business Her Majesty's Government intend to proceed with during what remains of the present Session; and also whether he is able to state the day on which Business will be concluded and the Prorogation take place? I should also like to ask him whether he can state the course the Government intend to take with regard to No. 6 Order, the Police Enfranchisement Extension Bill. The right hon. Gentleman will see that the Bill involves very contentious matter; and, having regard to the understanding that contentious matter should not be proceeded with, I should like to ask him what course he intends to take?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: The last Bill to which the noble Marquess refers is a private Member's Bill, and all I have stated with regard to it is that we would endeavour to afford my hon. Friend who brought it in (Mr. Coleridge Kennard) such facilities as might enable him to take the sense of the House on the Motion that the Speaker do leave the Chair. Of course, it does not rest with me or with Her Majesty's Government to decide whether a contentious measure introduced by a private Member should or should not be proceeded with; but I rather question—considering the fact that it was strongly supported on the second reading by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Derby (Sir William Harcourt) and some hon. Members below the Gangway on the opposite side of the House—whether this Bill can fairly be called a contentious measure. The Business of the Government for the rest of the Session will be practically confined to the first two Orders on the Paper—the Housing of the Working Classes and the Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill—there will, I think, be nothing else that can be called of a contentious nature, and we hope that the House may pass both those measures. The Bill for the Housing of the Working Classes is rather the Bill of the Royal Commission than of Her Mathey were forced to pay in order to live near their work. The principle of supply and demand did not apply in the case of those who had to be at their work at 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning. Another cause was the great multiplicity of interests that were involved in this class of property, and the difficulty of getting at the real owner of the property. In 1851 Lord Shaftesbury passed an Act which, in his opinion, ought to have done much to check the evil complained of. The object of that Act was to enable Vestries to appoint Commissioners to borrow money on the security of the rates for the erection of dwelling-houses to be managed under bye-laws to be framed by the Commissioners. But, unfortunately, that Act remained a dead letter owing to the smallness of the areas which it had formed. By the first portion of the present Bill it was proposed to extend those areas and to transfer the power of putting the Act into operation from the Vestries to the Metropolitan Board of Works. Another cause why Lord Shaftesbury's Act had been unsuccessful was that it had to be worked by too elaborate a machinery, and that its provisions were rendered almost nugatory by a series of saving clauses and of safeguards. It was now proposed that the present measure should be worked in the City of London by the Commissioners of Sewers, in the Metropolis by the Metropolitan Board of Works, and in the Provinces by the rural Sanitary Authorities. It was proposed to give to the latter authorities the power to build not only large blocks of buildings, but cottages in the country, to which should be attached half-an-acre of garden ground. He thought that this portion of the Bill would effect a great improvement in the existing law, and would conduce to the comfort and health of a great number of people. The real fact was that the difficulty of the over-crowding of houses had been increased by the demolition which had taken place by railways, by street improvements, and by other works. Therefore, when they wanted to build houses for the working classes, the question was, where were they to get the sites? Now, however, an opportunity was about to be afforded of obtaining land on which to erect this class of buildings, owing to the fact that the Prison Commissioners, for purposes of prison discipline, were very anxious to move the great prisons out of London and into the country. The result of such a step would be that there would be large vacant spaces of land available in different parts of London—at Clerkenwell, Millbank, Coldbath Fields, and Pentonville, which covered a great many acres. As they would be no longer required for prison purposes, they might well be utilized for the purpose of relieving the pressure in other parts of London. In accordance with the recommendations of the Commission, this Bill proposed to empower the Prison Commissioners to dispose of these sites to the Metropolitan Board as trustees, for the purpose of having this class of buildings erected upon them. It was not proposed that the Metropolitan Board should cover the land itself; but the Board might let it for the purpose to the Peabody trustees and bodies of that kind; and, of course, care would be taken to provide the open spaces, board schools, &c., which the population of such large areas would render necessary. There was one provision which was not in the Bill, but which might well have been included in accordance with the recommendation of the Royal Commission—namely, a provision giving the Metropolitan Board power to exchange these sites for sites in other parts of London which were more convenient. The next provision of the Bill was one about which there was some difference of opinion. It provided that the Prison Commissioners should, in fixing the price of these sites, have regard to the purposes for which the land was to be employed. Some of these sites would, if offered for sale to the public, probably be utilized for private residences and shops; and if the price charged was the price which the site would bring in the open market, it would be quite impossible to secure them for the purposes aimed at in this Bill. The price should be fixed at such a figure that those who secured any site might build upon it tenements for the poorer classes without incurring any loss. He did not desire to commit the House to the principle that the State was to contribute to the payment for sites for this purpose. The present was an exceptional case, and these prison sites might be regarded as an unexpected windfall—a Godsend. Nobody ever thought of having them—they came down as it were from the clouds. There was a great difficulty to be confronted for which some remedy must be found, and which would entail very grievous consequences unless provided for; and under these circumstances he hoped the House would, without pledging itself to the principle, yet accept the proposal in the clause. The fact was that the conditions under which the poor lived were deteriorating the standard of bodily strength, and this was getting worse from generation to generation. At the present time the loss of wages from ill-health would amply be sufficient in most cases to secure adequate and satisfactory dwelling accommodation for those who dwelt in dilapidated and unsanitary tenements. Another clause in the Bill dealt with the terms on which the money should be borrowed from the Public Works Loans Commissioners, and provided that if the security offered was ample the rate of interest should be the lowest possible compatible with its entailing no loss. Hitherto the Treasury proceeded on the principle that they must charge a higher rate than would actually pay for each loan, so as to cover losses in respect of other loans. But it would scarcely be fair to apply that principle to loans under this Bill, and it therefore provided that the interest should be the lowest possible that would enable such loans to be made without loss to the Exchequer, the interest in no case, however, to be less than £3 2*s.* 6*d.* per cent. This clause was only to be in force until the end of the year 1888, and was inserted so that something definite and practical might be done at once. The 4th clause, he knew, had been objected to, as one which apparently gave powers to the Local Government Board to make orders on Vestries to do certain acts. He thought, however, that the Vestries need not be very much frightened by the clause, inasmuch as it only slightly extended the powers which the Local Government Board already possessed. The Act of 1875 left matters in this unsatisfactory condition—that if the Medical Officer of Health made his Report to the Metropolitan Board of Works, and that Board considered that it was not a matter that required to be dealt with, the Secretary of State had power to appoint a special arbitrator to go and report. But the Secretary of State could not order anything to be done. The Bill proposed to give him power to invoke the assistance of the High Court of Justice to compel the Metropolitan Board to do its duty. He thought there ought to be some authority by which the Metropolitan Board, if it did not do its duty, should be compelled to do it. Dealing next with Clause 12 of the Bill, he said its object was to enable owners and corporations to deal with funds at their disposal, although they might be tied up in trusts, for this particular purpose of benefiting their estates. He did not see any objection to that clause, because it was to the benefit of the estate that they should be able to let free this money. The next clause, which was an important one, was liable to some objection. He thought, however, the building societies had been somewhat misled by the opposition they had organized against Clause 13. In the first place, he might at once say that he thought this clause was a good deal too wide as it at present stood. The Bill was intended to deal with the housing of the working classes and nothing else; therefore, he proposed to ask the House to allow the clause to be limited to the houses of the working classes only. Hon. Members might ask how he was to define the working classes, and in reply to that very natural question he might say that he had framed a clause, which he should bring forward on going into Committee, in which he had endeavoured to give that definition. Further, he thought the liability of the landlords should not be so wide as in the present clause; but that it should be limited to the condition of the houses at the time of letting. As to the remedy given to the tenant as expressed in the Preamble—namely, that the tenant of an unfurnished house should have the same remedy as in the case of the tenant of a furnished house, he did not see what objection could be raised. What was the case they had to meet? A number of wretched houses were run up; they were not properly drained or connected with the sewers, and generally they were in a very unsound condition as dwellings. He thought the owners should not be allowed to let such houses. They must say that the houses should not be let in this condition; but if let in this dilapidated condition the tenant should have a remedy against the landlord. He observed that in connection with this subject Lord Grey had written to *The Times* a letter in which he said that they ought to punish those persons for letting houses unfit for human habitation. This, however, was not a Criminal Bill; it gave the tenants a civil remedy. But it must be remembered, in discussing Lord Grey's proposition, that if they were to stop the letting of every house in this condition throughout London, he did not know what would become of the people who occupied them at the present moment. He thought that the contention of the noble Earl added strength to his argument on the earlier clause for taking advantage of the prison sites in order to get rid of this evil to a very large extent. He stated the other day that the Bill would be extended to Ireland, although the 17th clause, as it at present stood, said it should not. This provision was originally put in because the Report of the Irish Commissioners had not been presented to the public at the time the Bill was framed. He was also very wishful that the Bill should apply to Scotland. But in respect to Scotland he must put in these words, "so far as it is applicable," because there were certain clauses which required machinery to put them in operation which did not at present exist in Scotland. That machinery, however, might be created afterwards. In asking the House to give the Bill a second reading he urged hon. Members to reserve some of the disputed points for Committee. The Government would then be able to see how far they could meet the objections which might be raised to the points discussed. His excuse for bringing this Bill into the House at that period of the Session was that it was essential to do so; the need for it was so great that he did not think there was a single Member of the House who sat on the recent Commission who was not convinced that it was high time something was done, and done promptly. Although the measure was not a very large one, and would not remedy every grievance, for men must, after all, help themselves, it would yet do something in the direction of ameliorating the condition of the people who were living in a state of degradation and poverty; and, at all events, it would show that the Legislature was willing to help the people so far as legislation could effect that object. It was on that ground that he submitted the Bill confidently to the favourable consideration of the House. The right hon. Gentleman concluded by moving the second reading of the Bill.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Mr. LYULPH STANLEY, in rising to move—

> "That it is inexpedient at this stage of the Session to initiate legislation involving the principle of a National subsidy towards aiding any locality in providing dwellings for the working class in such locality."

said, that in placing this Notice on the Paper he did not wish to prevent useful legislation which would do good to the condition of the poor; but though in one sense he considered this a very small Bill in relation to the magnitude of the evils with which it dealt, yet it was a Bill which incidentally raised one or two important and extensive principles—principles which, in his judgment, were so dangerous that they ought to be considered very carefully, and at a time when the House of Commons was able to consider them fairly. It was, however, almost impossible at this time of the Session for a Bill of this kind to be considered carefully. The attendance of the House was thin, and hon. Members were jaded, while the Business remained practically in the hands of the Government. There had been a misapprehension about the Bill, and about its relation to the Royal Commission, which he thought it his duty to correct, because that misapprehension first found expression in some remarks made in the other House of Parliament by the noble Lord at the head of the Government. The noble Lord said—

> "That the Bill had been drawn up with the unanimous consent of the Members of the Commission on the Housing of the Working Classes."

So far from this being the case, the Commissioners were never consulted in any way from first to last as to this Bill in any shape or form. He believed it was true that a consultation had been held between his right hon. Friend the Chairman of the Commission (Sir Charles W. Dilke) and the noble Lord at the head of the Government; but no consultation between two individuals, however distinguished or important, could be treated as the unanimous consent of the Commission. It was evident that the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House was under a similar misapprehension, because that evening he spoke of the Bill as being a Bill of the Commission; and it was only when he met with emphatic denials from three Members of the Commission present in the House that that remark was passed over. While he was desirous of passing such laws as would improve the state of things existing among the poorer classes of town and country, they ought to be free to consider this Bill on its merits; and it ought not to be supposed that the Members of the Royal Commission presented the Bill to the House as the outcome of their conclusions, much less of their unanimous conclusions. No one could doubt that there were grave evils connected with the housing of the working classes which demanded a remedy if a suitable and reasonable remedy could be found; but he trusted the House would consider this question in a calmer frame of mind than they did another important social question which had recently been before the House, and which was intimately connected with the housing of the poor. He would not enter into a discussion of the application of the principles of political economy to this question; but there were certain general principles which were thoroughly applicable to the present condition of things, and if, in the eager pursuit of some philanthropic result, those principles were violated, it was likely that more harm than good would be done. This Bill simply pottered about with a few trumpery little remedies, and he could not help viewing it as it stood with a good deal of suspicion. During the last 20 years a great improvement had taken place in the social condition of the working classes, and in existing circumstances it was not of so much importance to do something as to do the right thing. In dealing with a great question like this he thought it was far better to be willing to wait a few months, or possibly a year, and deal with the question in a thorough way rather than by touching the fringe of the question, and passing a paltry little Bill to give an excuse to those who really did not care much about anything being done to say—"Oh, your housing of the working classes was dealt with in a Bill in the Session of 1885. See how your remedies work, and do not raise the question again." He thought he should have the support of the Home Secretary for the general principle that the true remedies for the evils which existed were those which raised up the self-respect and self-reliance and self-help of the people and their administration in their local communities. The wish of almost every man in the House was to get away from centralization; and he did not believe that they could ever have satisfactory results while there was a weak or a non-representative local government. He was afraid the Home Secretary had not that faith in popular self-government which some of those on the Liberal Benches had; for when the right hon. Gentleman was last in Office he introduced a measure, shortly before the fall of the Conservative Government, the Water Bill for London, in which he showed a very great distrust of the popular representative government of London, whatever it might be, and created a Water Trust, largely of a nominative and non-representative character. But he (Mr. Lyulph Stanley) declared most emphatically that they would never reform the great towns unless the people of those towns were largely trusted in their administration, and unless they gave the people the greatest power to bring their will to bear upon their Representatives. The Commission had recognized this, and had mentioned reform of the government of London as a condition precedent to the improvement of London. There was another important recommendation of the Commission which was really essential to any reform in these matters. The pressure of the rates was felt very severely by the poorer classes; and the Commission unanimously agreed that at the root of this question lay the question of a fairer incidence of the rates. He quite agreed that the difficulty of acquiring sites was one of the chief difficulties in providing dwellings for the poor; and unless some means could be devised of facilitating the acquisition of sites the question could not be adequately dealt with. The Commission had recommended that vacant land in the neighbourhood of towns should be rated in some relation to its capital value, and not upon what it produced yearly. Nothing would do more to bring the land into the market, and bring down the ground-rents, and so facilitate the acquisition of sites. But while the Bill took no notice of these proposed remedies, he asserted that it encouraged centralization, and especially in Clause 5. If the Local Authority did not agree with the health officer, the Bill made the Central Government the Court of Appeal in London between the health officer and the Municipal Authority, and enabled the Central Authority, if they took the side of the health officer, to order the Local Authority to carry out a scheme which might cost £100,000 or £200,000. In reference to the prison sites, he also remarked that while the Home Secretary attached importance to allocating those sites for the housing of the poor in London, he did not in his speech attach the same importance to parting with them below their real value; and he pointed out the difference made in the Bill between the Coldbath Fields, the Millbank, and the Pentonville sites. Under the Bill two of those sites were to be sold by the Treasury, and the third with the consent of the Middlesex Justices. If the Bill became law the Treasury would be bound to give effect to the recommendation of Parliament on the subject; but the Middlesex Justices were a *quasi*-private Corporation, not responsible to Parliament, and could do what they pleased in the matter. If political economy was to be violated, he would far rather it should be done in the case of the Coldbath Fields site than in the case of the other sites, for if there was a pressing need anywhere it was at Coldbath Fields. The Home Secretary had afforded the House no indication of what was the amount of the subsidy which it was asked to give to the people of London. According to evidence given before the Commission, builders could afford to pay about £10,000 per acre for land for working-class dwellings; and if the sites in question were thrown away at that price, the Government might possibly, at some future date, have to purchase and clear land for national purposes in a central situation in London. The State had had to pay enormous sums for sites in the neighbourhood of Millbank for public purposes; and he asked—Were they sure that those sites, when set free from prisons, would not be useful to the State for other purposes? The present enlargement of the National Gallery had been very costly, and there must before long be another enlargement of that institution. Why should not the barracks be removed to Millbank, so as to set free space for the enlargement of the National Gallery? Again, other sites probably would have to be acquired for other public purposes. It was possible that the subsidy to be granted to the Metropolis might amount to as much as £500,000; but supposing that only £200,000 were asked for, would it not be better, while granting such a sum, to consider first of all which were the poorest parts of the country where such assistance was most required? If they now gave that large subsidy to London —the richest City in the world, which already obtained so many advantages at the expense of the State—with what face could they resist democratic pressure from other parts of the country demanding similar subsidies? If this measure were passed, with what face could they hereafter resist the democratic pressure that would be sure to be brought to bear upon them in numberless ways, and for a variety of purposes? If they were to adopt Socialism in any form, let it be local and municipal Socialism, which would be kept in sufficient restraint by the votes of the ratepayers. But if once they introduced State Socialism, there might be no end to the demands that would be made. The cry from every popular constituency would be "Give, give." A far more democratic Parliament than the present one would shortly be in existence, and they ought to be very guarded in the dying hours of the present Parliament of setting up a precedent, which he could not but regard as of the most mischievous kind. Miss Octavia Hill had said that when the State stepped in in such a case as this to do a little, it paralyzed all private enterprize in that direction. State interference of this kind was full of danger; and if it was said that the value of the gift to London would be but small, then it was not worth while to incur that danger for the purpose of giving a miserable dole of some £50,000 to the working classes of London. The principle of this measure was the exact contrary of that which had been laid down by the Chancellor of the Exchequer at Bristol on Saturday last, when he protested against leading the poor to look to the State for relief from their difficulties. The Home Secretary must be very confiding when he proposed to instruct the Metropolitan Boards of Works with the power to carry out this measure after they had built blocks on the site of Newort Market, and by the side of Gray's Inn Road, so crowded that in a few years they would probably be fever nests as bad as the buildings they had superseded. The right hon. Baronet would have done better had he introduced a Bill which would have provided for the creation of a real Municipality for the Metropolis. Section 13 rather went beyond the recommendations of the Commissioners. It should be limited to the condition of the premises at the time of the letting, and should only render the landlord liable for any damage suffered by reason of his negligence or default. Where tenants were constantly changing it was impossible for the landlord to examine the state of the drains before each new tenant entered into possession; and it would be unfair to make him liable for some defects which was caused by a recent tenant. He hoped that at this period of the Session the Government would not persist with the clause relating to the Government subsidy, since it was raising a very large question for a very small object, there being much opposition to the clause, and the amount of the subsidy being only small. He begged to move the Amendment which stood in his name.

Amendment proposed,

To leave out from the word "That" to the end of the Question, in order to add the words "it is inexpedient at this stage of the Session to initiate legislation involving the principle of a National subsidy towards aiding any locality in providing dwellings for the working class in such locality,"—(*Mr. Lyulph Stanley*,)

—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Question."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Lyulph Stanley) had directed the greater part of his speech against a particular clause; but inasmuch as he was not the author of that clause, and only supported it as a compromise, he did not feel called upon to reply in detail to his hon. Friend's observations. The hon. Member certainly had every right to address the House on this question, because there was no Member of the Commission who gave more time and thought to its proceedings. The hon. Member said this was not the Bill of the Royal Commission. That was perfectly true, for the Members of the Commission were never consulted as to the clauses of the Bill. The Report of the Commission was given to the draftsman with those parts of it marked which he was to incorporate into the Bill, and that had been done. The hon. Member had given no illustrations as to the points in which the Bill differed from the Report of the Royal Commission. It might, no doubt, have been desirable that the clause with regard to the prison sites should follow the Report of the Commission more closely; but the Home Secretary, it appeared, was willing to meet his hon. Friend on this point. Sub-section 2 of Clause 5 also differed from the Report of the Commission; but upon this also the Home Secretary had expressed his willingness to make alterations, and he should be quite willing to assist his hon. Friend in making such modification as would make the clause agree with the terms of the Report. His hon. Friend said this was a centralizing Bill. No doubt some clauses might be so characterized; but many other clauses, on the contrary, gave greater powers to the Local Authorities. The hon. Member evidently desired that legislation on this subject should be delayed until after the reform of local government. He did not yield to the hon. Member or anyone in his desire to see the reform of local government in London, in the country, and in other portions of the United Kingdom; but he could not agree that it was desirable to wait until these reforms were carried before dealing with this subject of the housing of the poor and with the subject of public health in the Metropolis, as suggested by the Royal Commission and as attempted in the Bill introduced by Lord Salisbury. The Public Health Act which applied to England did not apply to the Metropolis, and there were in that Act many important principles which it was highly desirable should be extended to the Metropolis. The hon. Member had also spoken of the rating of vacant land. It would, however, be very difficult to carry the principle of rating vacant land without at the same time providing for the rating of vacant houses, against which there were many objections, among others this—that it would discourage building. The hon. Member spoke of the Bill of the hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Broadhurst) dealing with leaseholds; but he had to point out that there was very strong opposition in the House and in the country to the change, and it was most undesirable to make the whole of the recommendations of the Royal Commission depend for Parliamentary sanction on the acceptance of the principles of the hon. Member. His hon. Friend went on to speak of the centralizing spirit in which the Bill had been drawn; but he took exception altogether to that statement. He wished now to point out to the House that although there were three Motions directed against the Bill, all three were Committee Motions, rather than Second Reading Motions. Each of those Motions took exception to one clause of the Bill, but they did not attack the Bill as a whole; and none of them constituted, in his opinion, reasons why the House should reject the Bill as a whole. The Motion of the hon. Member for Oldham, and the main drift of his speech in support of it, were directed against Clause 3; the Motion of the hon. and learned Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood) was directed against Clause 13, and the Motion of the hon. Member for Brighton (Mr. Hollond) was directed against the 2nd sub-section of Clauses 4 and 5. The hon. Member for Brighton had probably not quite understood the meaning of the 2nd sub-section of Clause 4; but, as some modifications had been promised with respect to Clause 5, he hoped the hon. and learned Member for Stockport would wait until the Committee stage to see what the modifications were. He should like to state to hon. Members who might wish to delay the Bill his own reasons for thinking that the general feeling on both sides of the House was in favour of the passing of the Bill. His hon. Friends put down Motions and made speeches which were directed against particular portions of the Bill; but neither the Motions nor the speeches were likely to attack or touch the great majority of the clauses of the Bill, and there were some provisions of the Bill which seemed to him ought to commend themselves specially to Members who sat on the Opposition side of the House. He thought that the main reasons why they ought to desire that this Bill should pass, even at that late period of the Session, were three. The Bill reversed the principle with regard to the rate of loans for this purpose, established in 1879, in spite of a very strong resistance from his own side of the House. He saw present his right hon. Friend the Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) and his right hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain), who used in 1879 exactly the same arguments and almost the same words which had been used by the Home Secretary that evening. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Reading, attacking the proposals of the then Chancellor of the Exchequer, Lord Iddesleigh, said that he founded his Bill upon the fact of losses on certain loans; but he pointed out to the House that the losses were not on loans of this kind, but losses which had occurred on loans of an improvident kind, and on wholly insufficient security. One reason why they then pointed out, and why they now pointed out, that the rate of interest could be lowered on loans of this description was because only one-half of the money was advanced under the general conditions of the loan, and there had never been a case of failure to return the money, because the buildings formed ample security for the loan thus advanced. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham, in seconding the Motion of his right hon. Friend the Member for Reading, said that the tendency of the change made in 1879 was, to use his phrase, to kill the Artizans' Dwellings Act; and there could be no doubt that the alterations in the rates of loans had a detrimental effect on the working of that Act. There was no difference of opinion on that point; but the action taken by his right hon. Friends in 1879 had been justified by the evidence and the Report of the Royal Commission. This was the first point on which it was of great importance that this Bill should pass. There was another point which was not mentioned by the hon. Member for Oldham in the course of his speech. It was most desirable that at the earliest possible moment they should take away the power to compel Local Authorities to purchase any property they touched under what were known as the Torrens Acts. There was almost unanimity among the Royal Commissioners on this point. He ventured to say that it was very important indeed that they should remove that power of compelling the Local Authorities to purchase which had so greatly hampered the working of those Acts. A third question of importance was the obtaining, for the first time, as regarded England and Scotland, under this Bill, the opportunity of giving Local Authorities power to compulsorily take land for the purpose of cottage gardens. That was an entirely new principle as regarded England, and it was one under this Bill which was not likely to be largely applied; but it was a most interesting experiment. Dealing next with the Bill, the right hon. Gentleman said the first two clauses of the Bill simplified the working of Lord Shaftesbury's Act of 1851, and made it possible for that Act to come into force. If the right hon. Gentleman wished to apply this Bill to Scotland, he suggested that a clause should be inserted making it certain that Lord Shaftesbury's Act of 1851 applied to Scotland. The evidence given before the Royal Commisson in Edinburgh left a doubt on the fact as to whether that Act was applicable to Scotland. It had been a dead letter so far as England was concerned; it had never been worked in a single case. It had been applied to Ireland in 1866, and there it had been enforced, which was a remarkable fact, considering that the Local Authorities in Ireland were badly constituted, and that the towns in Ireland were, as a whole, less well-governed than the towns in England. It was probable when they reached the Committee stage the hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Jesse Collings) would make an attempt to remove some of the limitations in this clause. He should support those limitations as a compromise to which he had been a party; but he trusted that if the principle was found to work they would be able to get rid of those limitations later on. The hon Member for Oldham had directed the main portion of his remarks against Clause 3. He (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had already told the House that that clause was not his. At first he voted against the first proposal of the Commission and the whole principle of this clause; but he considered that the present form in which the clause came was a modification of the original proposals to which he was a party. As far as he was concerned, therefore, he should vote for the clause. The defence which occurred to him as the wisest one to make was this—that it was an equitable clause, an assertion of the same principle which an enormous majority in the House of Commons sanctioned against the strong feeling of the Government of the day in the case of the Thames Embankment. In that case the Commissioners of Woods and Forests went to the utmost length which public officials had ever gone by fulminating against the majority of the House of Commons, and by publishing in the papers from day to day their reasons why the House of Commons was committing an act of spoliation and plunder. The House of Commons, on that occasion, thought it was necessary, in dealing with what the right hon. Gentleman that evening had called a windfall, to introduce principles more equitable than those strict principles of pounds, shillings, and pence. The hon. Member for Oldham expressed doubt as to interfering with private enterprize; but he must point out to the hon. Member that the whole principle of the Artizans' Dwellings Act of 1875 was, to some extent, an interference with private enterprize. The assistance which was given to the Peabody Trustees was an interference with private enterprize; and they had gone a long way in interfering with private enterprize in dealing with this question. The hon. Member also expressed doubts on the point of exorbitant rents. Witnesses had shown that the peculiar and exceptional circumstances attaching to central districts of London and Liverpool did lead to the exaction of exorbitant rents; and with that evidence before them it was not possible seriously to argue whether rents in certain portions of London and Liverpool were or were not exorbitant. His hon. Friend had extracted a promise that that clause should be made consistent with the Report of the Commission, and should not go beyond the Report. His hon. Friend had quoted the Report, and had stated the objections that were made by the right hon. Member for Ripon (Mr. Goschen) to the proposal of the Bill; but although the right hon. Gentleman would oppose the clause in Committee, and thus give them an opportunity of considering it further, he had not made his objections to that clause a ground for opposing the second reading of the Bill. With regard to the sub-sections of Clauses 4 and 5, the Home Secretary had shown that the 2nd sub-section of Clause 4 had been misunderstood. It was not a general power given to the Local Government Board to interfere in the way of Torrens's Act for the first time; but it was a very slight extension of the power as to obstructive buildings which they had already had. If the power given under Torrens's Act was an objectionable one, it ought to be repealed. Although no one in the House was more opposed than he was to the principle of centralization, he said they should either sweep away the whole of the provision in that Act, or make it applicable in the way now proposed to obstructive buildings. The sub-section of Clause 5 was a different matter. He agreed with the hon. Member for Oldham that that clause was not properly drawn. In his latest draft of the clause the Government draftsman had not quite followed the Report of the Commission. At pages 34 and 35 of the Report they would find the argument which justified the insertion of that sub-section. It was pointed out in a great mass of evidence that the Metropolis was altogether exceptional in the difficulties which arose between Torrens's Act and Cross's Act. In the whole of the municipal parts of England where those Acts applied, the two sets of Acts were administered by the same Bodies; but in the case of London alone they had two different sets of Authorities administering the two sets of Acts. In the Metropolis Cross's Acts were administered by the Metropolitan Board of Works, and Torrens's Acts by the Vestries. The effect of that was that each Body tried to throw the responsibility on the other. The Officer of Health, who was the officer of the Vestry, reported a scheme under Cross's Acts; that Report was sent to the Metropolitan Board of Works, who in most cases sent it back to the Vestry and said the work ought to be done by a small scheme under Torrens's Acts; and ultimately the whole thing dropped through, and nothing whatever was done. The result was that Torrens's Acts were very little applied, and Cross's Acts had ceased to be applied at all. The question was, whether they should adopt some temporary remedy, or should wait until they had a general system of municipal government for London carried out. He thought it was desirable to adopt some temporary remedy, although no one was more anxious than he was to see a general system of municipal government for London established. The Commission rather desired that the remedy should be applied by the extension of the existing provisions of the law. It was already provided under Cross's Acts that an inquiry should be held by the Home Office; but although those inquiries were held, at the present moment there was no power of calling upon either of the two Local Authorities in London to carry out the scheme. It was the suggestion of the Royal Commission that there ought to be some mode of arbitration between the Vestries and the Metropolitan Board of Works. He thought that the 2nd sub-section of Clause 45 ought to be confined to the Metropolis, and might properly be modified. The hon. Member for Oldham had referred to the letter from Lord Grey which appeared in *The Times;* and it was desirable to point out that Lord Grey apparently wrote in ignorance of the present state of the law and bye-laws in regard to tenement houses. Lord Grey in that letter recommended a great many of the principles which were already found in the existing law. In the Public Health Act, the Sanitary Act for the Metropolis, and in the corresponding Acts for Scotland and Ireland, there were very large powers given to Local Authorities for dealing with tenement houses. Nothing except the supineness of the Local Authorities prevented the exercise of those powers; and if they said that their hands were tied by the Central Board in respect to the adoption or application of those bye-laws, the present Bill would leave it entirely to the Local Authorities to adopt them. The hon. Member for Oldham did not object to the clause which declared it the duty of the Local Authority to enforce the provisions of the law relating to public health. That provision had not been opposed, and therefore he would say nothing on it except that he had some doubt whether it was wise or not to introduce a provision which looked like a *brutum fulmen;* but on taking the advice of those who were best acquainted with the working of the laws relating to public health, they all declared that a clause of that kind would do good, and that clause was introduced with their assent. Clause 13 was objected to by Motions that stood on the Paper. It was, he thought, originally suggested by Lord Salisbury; but the evidence adduced before the Committee pointed to its adoption. He admitted the desirability of confining the Bill to the housing of the working classes; but, at the same time, he supported the principle as one which might be included in the general law. As to the application of the Act to Scotland and Ireland, the right hon. Gentleman stated that it was intended that it should apply to those two countries. He would make one suggestion to the right hon. Gentleman in regard to a certain difficulty which might arise in connection with the application of the Act to Scotland. The Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) Bill—a famous Bill as to which a difficulty arose the other night—was a very bulky measure, and it stood in rather a peculiar position. It passed its second reading, and went through a very careful examination by a Select Committee of that House last year, and it had been similarly dealt with by the House of Lords in the present Session. Under those circumstances, he should be glad himself if it were possible to pass that Bill this Session; but if there was opposition to it, of course, that was out of the question. But the Royal Commission, on its Scotch investigation, most strongly recommended the passing of that Bill, and it avoided making other recommendations as to the burghs of Scotland, because they found two facts very strongly marked in regard to them. One was the extreme desire of each Scottish town to adopt byelaws of its own, dealing with its questions in its own way, which they would be able to do under the Burgh Police and Health Bill, keeping their own Acts. The second was that they found the Scotch had a very stubborn dislike to the application to them of any provisions which interfered with private enterprize. As regards the rural districts in Scotland, the Commission strongly recommended a reform of the local government, which was greatly needed. As to the application to Scotland of that portion of the Bill dealing with Lord Shaftesbury's Act, he himself had no doubt. With regard to Ireland, it should be borne in mind that the Labourers (Ireland) Act went beyond the provisions of this Bill. Of course, this Bill would not form any bar or hindrance to the adoption of an improved system of local government. If he thought that the Bill would in the least degree stand in the way of an improved system of local government in the rural districts of this country, in the Metropolis, and in Scotland and Ireland, he should not give it his support. But he believed it would form no bar to such improvement; but that, on the contrary, its provisions would, in some respects, pave the way and inspire fresh energy in the effort to obtain better local self-government in the rural districts, because they would show the people some of the advantages which might be gained by local government. Though not a large Bill, he did not think it deserved the epithet of "paltry," which his hon. Friend had applied to it; and he could only hope that, though not such a large measure as he could wish, it would, nevertheless, be found not unworthy to grapple with some of the difficulties that surrounded this question.

MR. MONCKTON wished to say a word or two upon the clauses of the Bill dealing with sanitation. In his opinion, the clause giving power to a tenant to sue his landlord for damages in the event of sickness arising from the sanitary condition of his—the tenant's—dwelling was a mockery. He was fully persuaded of the importance of promoting improved sanitary conditions in the homes of the working classes, and it was his intention to move certain Amendments in Committee, with the object of extending still further the operation of the Bill in that direction. He thought they ought to make the powers of the Local Authorities compulsory instead of permissive, that every house should be inspected at least once in two years, and that no owner should be allowed to let a house without a certificate of its sanitary condition. He would especially advocate rendering Sanitary Inspectors independent of the Local Boards as to their appointment and dismissal, and empowering Local Authorities to charge a small fee for the inspection of houses.

MR. J. R. HOLLOND observed, that while some clauses of the Bill, if properly worked, would be very beneficial, many contained somewhat objectionable principles. He objected to the centralizing tendency of the Bill, and maintained that it would be much better to leave the Local Authorities fully responsible to the ratepayers who elected them with respect to dealing with insanitary houses. The measure was open to the objection that by giving this power to the Central Government the Local Sanitary Authorities might be discouraged from bringing forward schemes for the improvement of their respective areas. He hoped that the Government would give an assurance to the House that they would make some substantial concession in the way of making the ground landlords of London yield up a portion of that which they had gained by the increased prosperity of the country. He objected strongly to the Central Government applying the national funds for the benefit of a particular class in a particular locality. Such a proposal was dangerous in principle, and was, moreover, one which ought not to be adopted in the last days of a dying Parliament. He should be glad if Clause 3 was either substantially modified or dropped out of the Bill altogether.

Mr. BROADHURST said, that one of the reasons why he could have wished that this Bill had not been brought before the House was that it dealt only with the fringe of a great question, and that it might be made the pretext for not dealing with the question as a whole. He doubted the policy of this "very weak-kneed dose of Socialism," on account of the difficulty which people might experience under it in obtaining the advantages which the Government proposed to give them. If this measure were to be successfully worked, the Government would have to create a new Department, which must conduct the building operations and must fix both the present and the future rent of the tenements. If this were not done, the tenants would be charged the same rack rents as their neighbours, and all the advantages to be derived under this Bill would go into the pockets of those who conducted the building operations. One of the great complaints against the management of the Peabody Fund was that the wrong people got the benefit of it. He believed, with regard to Clause 3, that if the House could have heard the arguments that led up to the passing of that clause by the Royal Commission, it would be far less popular than it appeared to be. He had made a counter proposal to the effect that, if the prisons were removed, the sites should be used as open spaces rather than let out for building purposes. But if this benefit were to be conferred upon the Metropolis, he should like to know what they were going to say to the other constituencies? What were they going to say to the population of Stoke, who, when they heard that the working classes of London had obtained these advantages, would demand that the same favour should be extended to them? Was the Government prepared to make grants of pieces of land on which to build dwellings for the working classes to every borough in the Kingdom? He contended that they should not favour one particular part of the community at the expense of the general community; at the same time, if they extended the proposed system to the community as a whole, he would not have so much to say against it. Clause 3, however, admitted a very important principle—namely, that the unearned increment of the land belonged to the people. This was a somewhat startling admission on the part of the Head of the present Government, and would be welcomed by all land reformers; and he believed Mr. Henry George, when he read and thoroughly understood the whole import of Clause 3, would claim the Prime Minister as one of his converts, or, at any rate, as one who was going a considerable length towards his own principles with regard to land nationalization. So far as Clause 3 admitted the right of the people to the unearned increment of the land of the nation, he looked upon it as a most important one, and one which he could heartily support and endorse from that point of view. There were many points in the Report of the Royal Commission which had been left untouched by this Bill. There was, for instance, the question of Inspectors. There were Inspectors already; and the question was whether those Inspectors should be a reality or a sham—whether they should attend to the interests of the inhabitants, or to the interests of the Vestrymen, their employers. Any Bill that dealt with the question of the housing of the poor should provide that when Inspectors were appointed there should be some guarantee by certificate or examination that they possessed some kind of fitness for the duties they were called upon to discharge. Clause 13 appeared to have caused considerable alarm to a number of people. A body of gentlemen, representing themselves as a building society federation, had been interviewing the Home Secretary upon the subject; but he would like to ask the Home Secretary whether had he had any communication whatever directly from any building society on this question? There were building societies that existed for the benefit of their members, and others which, he feared, existed merely for speculation; and he ventured to say that there was no building society of the former class which had made any representation whatever against the stringency of Clause 13. The clause was really a protection to building societies, and not an injustice or injury to them. He should watch with very great jealousy any attempt to lessen the strength of that clause. He would not now enter into his reasons for thinking that the clause should rather be strengthened; but he must give the right hon. Gentleman Notice that should any considerable modification be proposed he should have seriously to oppose it. He was sorry to find that one of the recommendations of the Royal Commissioners as to the enfranchisement of leaseholds was not embodied in the Bill. That went to the whole root of the question of overcrowding in the great towns; and as the supplementary Report on that subject had been signed by Cardinal Manning, Mr. Lyulph Stanley, Mr. Samuel Morley, Mr. Torrens, Mr. Godwin, Mr. Collins, the Lord Provost of Edinburgh, and himself, and was as much a recommendation of the Commission as the majority Report itself, he had looked with the greatest confidence for its inclusion in the Bill. It would be far better for the victims of overcrowding if the present Bill was withdrawn, so that a more thorough and complete measure might be introduced next Session. This Bill dealt with the mere fringe of the question, and to pass it in the dying moments of a Parliament would be a most doubtful proceeding.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS said, he believed that if there were not a General Election ahead this Bill would have been postponed till next Session. He had no objection to its passing; it would do no harm, and it would do but little good; but it contained a principle which he valued. He did not believe that such a small Bill could be the final outcome of the labours of the Royal Commission. It was acknowledged that there were ample powers for sanitary purposes conferred by the existing law, and that to carry them out we required rural municipalities and better local government in London; and yet this Bill gave more powers before the agencies were reformed. The right hon. Gentleman said the evil was very great, and that it was time to deal with it; but this Bill did not deal with that evil, and it could only be a settlement for a Session, so that it would be just as well to postpone it. It embodied a proposition signed by the Marquess of Salisbury and another Commissioner; but it ignored propositions that were signed by several Commissioners. The clause which gave a Central Authority power over a Local Authority, and so rendered it possible that a Sanitary Inspector might be independent of the Local Authority, was not calculated to produce good local government. It would lead to the abuse of municipal authority, and it would produce local resentment against compulsion exercised by the Central Authority. One would have thought that one difficulty of this sort would have been sufficient for the Government. They were engaged in a dispute with the Local Authority of Limerick, and that was but a sample of what might be anticipated if in England an attempt were made to coerce Local Authorities by the Central Authority. What he valued in the Bill was the application of the Shaftesbury Act of 1851 to rural districts. He knew it had been a dead letter; but the introduction of it into this Bill was an admission of the principle of the compulsory acquisition of land by the Local Authority. This was a principle for which he had contended for a long time, and which many others wished to see affirmed for other purposes. He did not think the principle would be very effective as it here stood, because the Public Health Act of 1875 was incorporated with the Act which required that any land acquired by the Local Authority should be under the Lands Clauses Act, making it thereby so expensive, and giving the landlord such advantages, that he did not think Local Authorities would be likely to put the law in force.

Nevertheless, the principle was affirmed in one of the clauses of the present Bill. His hon. Friend the Member for Oldham (Mr. Lyulph Stanley) spoke lightly of the state of things as revealed by the Commission. He would, however, ask hon. Members to read the evidence on which this Bill was based, and which showed that misery, degradation, and suffering of a kind, and to an extent that was simply disgraceful, existed in our midst. That was one reason more why this Bill should be postponed to another Session, in order that the public might know the manner in which the great bulk of the people were living. He could assure the right hon. Gentleman that if he passed the Bill this Session, it would be but the prelude to another measure next year, because the working classes and the poorer classes who were subject to the evils which he had been describing would not consent any longer to bear the maximum of all the discomforts of this life and the minimum of all that made life worth living. He did not now say what clauses could be added to the Bill to meet this state of things; but no measure would be satisfactory which did not contain provisions to place the great mass of the people in London and in the country, as far as their dwellings and surroundings were concerned, in altogether a different position from that which they at present occupied. The Commissioners almost agreed that there were two causes of the evils they were considering. First, there was the poverty of the people, who could not afford the rents asked for superior accommodation; and, secondly, there was the cupidity of the owners of the sites, who demanded the highest rents from those who wished to build on those sites, and thus rendered dearer the cost of the working man's dwelling. Neither of these points would be touched by the present Bill. He would recommend the right hon. Gentleman to consider a remedy which was discussed by the Royal Commission, and which was embodied in a Memorandum signed by six or eight Members. That remedy—and he believed it to be the only effectual one—was to find some means by which the competition rents in populous districts might be stayed. The evidence showed that the ever increasing price of land making the acquisition of sites more and more difficult was at the bottom of the evil. Yet they did not hear of any suggestion from the Government with regard to that difficulty. It was in the action of Local Municipal Authorities that the real remedy was to be found. The only solution of the difficulty was first to create a real Local Authority of a purely elective character, and then to empower it to acquire the land and the dwellings in all those districts which were scheduled as populous. If the Local Authority acquired them at a fair price, taking everything into consideration, competition rents would be stopped. The Municipal Authority would have no interest, like private individuals, in making a profit out of the degradation and the poverty of the people who were compelled to live in a populous district; or if a profit were made it would belong to the community. He hoped hon. Members would not be frightened by the word "Socialism," which simply meant the interdependence of all classes of society.

Sir GABRIEL GOLDNEY, interposing, remarked that if they went into the general question of Socialism they would be a very long time discussing this measure.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS went on to say that the action of the Local Authority, as he understood it, simply implied the interdependence of members of society on one another. Would the right hon. Gentleman introduce a clause on the lines of the hon. Member for Stoke's Bill for the Enfranchisement of Leaseholds? That recommendation was signed by 10 out of the 17 Members of the Commission. With regard to the sale of prison sites, he was glad to find recognized the principle, that as the value of land had increased in consequence of the labour of the people, that increase ought to go back in some way to the people. That principle was not only in the Bill, but also in Lord Salisbury's Memorandum, in which he spoke of the sale at a reduced price of these sites as—

> "The surrender of an increase caused by that very concentration which it is applied to remedy. It more closely resembles," continues the Memorandum, "the provision of compensation than the offer of a gift."

Those words of Lord Salisbury had a far wider application than was given them in the Bill, and he should like to see them applied in a really efficient measure to some of the great estates of the Kingdom. Then the Bill did not deal with the evil as it existed in the rural districts, where on large estates cottages had been pulled down year after year, so that the accommodation for labourers was reduced both in quantity and kind. The Bill, in fact, did not go nearly far enough, and he would suggest to the Government that it should be read a second time, so as to affirm its principle; but it was simply ridiculous to attempt dealing with a great but imperfect measure like the present at the fag-end of the Session. He therefore hoped that, without further waste of time, it might be relegated to the new Parliament, and re-introduced in a considerably improved form.

SIR GABRIEL GOLDNEY said, the Bill embodied some of the more important recommendations of the Report of the Royal Commission. It was not intended to carry all the recommendations into effect, and which could scarcely be done in a single measure; but he thought the last speaker's proposal was not characterized by even the shadow of Christian charity, for it contained in pronounced form the suggestion that the misery and vice which the Bill in some, though it might be an inadequate, degree, was designed to remedy, should be allowed to continue till another Session and till more drastic remedies could be applied. He hoped the House would read the Bill a second time, and at once consider it in Committee.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he wished to express his sense of the importance of the great service which had been rendered to the country by the Royal Commission, and especially by his right hon. Friend the Chairman of the Commission, who presided so ably over its investigations. In the course of his experience he did not think there had been a Royal Commission which, during so short a time, had covered such a great extent of ground. It appeared to him to have conducted the inquiry with enormous labour, and it had completed its work in a much shorter time than it was originally possible to expect. It might be that they were not able to give full effect to the recommendations of the Royal Commission; but he thought it would be unfortunate if the Session should close without giving effect to some, at least, of those recommendations. He could not, therefore, support any Amendment which would have the effect of defeating the Bill. There were some parts of the Bill which he could not altogether approve; but there were many parts of it on which all were agreed. The clause was an important one, which enabled Local Authorities in rural districts to purchase land with the view of building cottages where it was proved to the satisfaction of the Central Authority, which he believed would be the Local Government Board, that the cottages were insufficient or altogether inappropriate to the number of persons who lived in them. He thought that was a most valuable clause; but he regretted that the duties and the rights of the Local Authorities in this connection were not more clearly stated in the Bill. It was only by implication that this power was conferred on Local Authorities. He could not but think that in a Bill of this kind it was important that a main object of this kind should be clearly stated, so that the Local Authorities, in reading the Bill, should be enabled clearly to understand the provision and perceive its object. He did not know whether it was too late to make an Amendment in this respect; but he would suggest to the right hon. Gentleman in charge of the Bill whether it would not be well in the 1st clause to lay down clearly and in unmistakable language the right and the duty of the Local Authorities to act in this direction. Another clause with which he most heartily agreed was that dealing with the provision in the Torrens's Acts relating to the compulsory purchase by Local Authorities of condemned buildings. He thought that provision had been the cause of the Torrens's Acts being of comparatively little effect, and the repeal of that provision was important. He approved strongly of Clause 6, which reverted to the original Act of 1875, in regard to the rates of interest charged by the State in the case of Local Authorities. In 1879 he and his right hon. Friend the Member for Birmingham sat through nearly a whole night for the purpose of obstructing the proposal of the then Chancellor of the Exchequer to charge a higher rate of interest. He pointed out then that the proposal of the Government of that day would have the effect of killing the Artizans' Dwellings Act, and he did his best to hinder that provision passing into law. He was gratified to find that the Royal Commission had taken his view of the matter. There was one respect in which the Bill appeared to him to be deficient. There was no provision for carrying out the recommendation of the Royal Commission with reference to the limitation of compensation to be given under the Artizans' Dwellings Act. He did not find in the Bill any effect given to the recommendation of the Commissioners that where a tenement house was occupied by several persons compensation in respect of it should not be in respect of the number of persons, but that it should have reference to the number of persons who ought properly to be lodged in the house. That was an alteration in the law recommended by the Royal Commission, and he did not find any corresponding clause in the Bill. This, however, was a matter which he presumed would stand over to a future day, and perhaps by next year they might have further experience of the Act of 1882, which had not yet been fully tried, and with further experience it might be possible to go further in this direction. The compensation which had been awarded in respect of sites cleared under the operation of that Act had been excessive, and this had tended seriously to reduce the operation of the Act. He had some objection to Clause 13. He did not wish to pronounce dogmatically upon it. In principle he was rather in favour of that which was laid down in the clause, if it could be applied in such a way as not to cause great alarm. At the same time, it had created so much alarm among the owners of house property that he believed it would be desirable to postpone legislation on that part of the subject till next year. Another clause which he would also recommend the right hon. Gentleman to deal with in the same way was that as to the prison sites. There, again, he did not venture to speak dogmatically; there was much to be said on both sides; but the principle about to be adopted was an extremely novel one, and it might carry them much further than the particular cases now under consideration. In many parts of the country there was Crown property. The proposal made seven or eight years ago with reference to the Thames Embankment had been alluded to. There the property belonged to the Woods and Forests, and the principle adopted in that case was that the Crown in respect of property of that kind was justified in taking into account certain interests of the public, and in dealing with its property as private owners did. But it must be recollected that there was a large amount of Crown property throughout the country, and, therefore, that argument might carry them much further and lead to results of considerable importance. He would also remark that they were entirely without information as to the value of the property now proposed to be dealt with. Were the sites of Millbank and the other prisons really valuable sites or were they not? He had heard different opinions on that point. He had heard that Millbank was an extremely valuable site; that it would sell for a very large sum of money; and, if the principle proposed to be applied by the Bill were adopted, it might be that the difference between the selling value of the land and that for which it would be sold for the purposes of that Bill would probably be not less than £300,000 or £400,000. If that was the case, what they practically now asked to do was to give a subvention to the Metropolis of a sum to that amount. He could not but think that that was a very novel principle, and that it might give rise to claims on the part of other towns to be dealt with in the same way. On the other hand, if the value of the property was a small one, and the difference between the value of the site in the open market and the price to be obtained for it as a site for working class dwellings would not be considerable, the question might not be a very serious one. If that were the case, why could not the Metropolitan Board of Works—one of the most wealthy Local Authorities in the Kingdom—buy the property and give the full value for it, and not raise a question of that importance? All, however, that he said on the point at present was that it was one on which there was so much difference of opinion that he thought it would be well if the right hon. Gentleman would postpone that very contentious question till next Session. In conclusion, although the harvest at present might not be a large one, he hoped they might be allowed to gather it; but, as there were other questions not dealt with in that Bill which must come under the consideration of the Legislature at an early period, they might, he thought, leave to that period some of the contentious matter to which he had referred.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. Balfour) said, that the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down agreed with the Mover of the Amendment in advising them to relegate at least one contentious question till next Session. The hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Lyulph Stanley) was anxious that they should not discuss the question of the housing of the poor until they had determined—first, the whole question of local burdens; secondly, what hon. Gentlemen called the land question; thirdly, the question of local government; and, fourthly, the question of leasehold tenure in towns. Was it to be seriously supposed that next Session would be a Session in which they would have a large amount of leisure to discuss those questions? He was quite prepared to leave to the next Parliament everything which it could most properly discuss; but if they could, by common agreement on both sides, do something material—he did not say how much—to improve the dwellings of the working classes, was it common sense to defer it until the whole catalogue of gigantic problems which the hon. Member for Oldham had desired them to discuss had been finally disposed of by the new Parliament? The hon. Member for Oldham seemed to think that everything would be put right if they only had a good system of local self-government. Now, he was as anxious for local self-government as the hon. Member; but let them constitute their Local Governing Bodies how they pleased, they would not always be ready to carry out the duties which Parliament desired to impose on them. The hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Broadhurst) thought the remedy for the existing evil was a good Leasehold Bill. Now, individually, he had a prejudice in favour of houses being built in towns on a tenure substantially equal to a freehold site. In Scotland, and in parts of Lancashire, that had been an habitual practice; but when he was told that overcrowding, insanitary dwellings, and all the other great social diseases with which that Bill was intended to cope, had their origin in the fact that a large part of the Metropolis was held under leases from ground landlords, he reminded the House that those evils existed in towns in this country and in other countries where the question of leases never arose, and, among other places, in Edinburgh, in Glasgow, in Paris, in Berlin, and in New York. The clause of this Bill dealing with prison sites had excited more controversy of a general kind than any other provision in it. The hon. Member for Stoke asked how they could justify handing over to that Metropolis a large grant of public property unless they were equally prepared to hand over to other local bodies and other towns grants of a like character? The hon. Member, in fact, said that he objected to handing over the unearned increment of rent to the ratepayers of the Metropolis. But, having said that, he went on to say that he did, after all, approve of the clause to a certain extent, because it recognized the principle that the unearned increment belonged to the people. Both those arguments could not be sound, and, therefore, it was for the hon. Member to choose between them. But, as a matter of fact, the introduction of the question of unearned increment into the treatment of this question was utterly irrelevant, and Mr. George's theories, whatever might be their value, had no relation to the Bill. He would not go into a justification of the clause in detail; but he would urge in particular this argument—that London was the place where most injury had been done to the working classes by displacements carried out under Act of Parliament, and London was also the one town in the United Kingdom where the greatest injury had been done to the working classes by compelling them to migrate. There was something, therefore, not altogether unfair in asking Parliament to partially undo the wrong Parliament itself had inflicted. Moreover, Pentonville was a national prison, and it occupied a site which practically threw much too great a burden on the taxpayers, and, therefore, the passing of this clause might be regarded as paying off what the country owed to London. These were the pleas on which he would recommend the House to accept the clause, which, at the same time, he frankly admitted was open in some killing the Artizans' Dwellings Act, and he did his best to hinder that provision passing into law. He was gratified to find that the Royal Commission had taken his view of the matter. There was one respect in which the Bill appeared to him to be deficient. There was no provision for carrying out the recommendation of the Royal Commission with reference to the limitation of compensation to be given under the Artizans' Dwellings Act. He did not find in the Bill any effect given to the recommendation of the Commissioners that where a tenement house was occupied by several persons compensation in respect of it should not be in respect of the number of persons, but that it should have reference to the number of persons who ought properly to be lodged in the house. That was an alteration in the law recommended by the Royal Commission, and he did not find any corresponding clause in the Bill. This, however, was a matter which he presumed would stand over to a future day, and perhaps by next year they might have further experience of the Act of 1882, which had not yet been fully tried, and with further experience it might be possible to go further in this direction. The compensation which had been awarded in respect of sites cleared under the operation of that Act had been excessive, and this had tended seriously to reduce the operation of the Act. He had some objection to Clause 13. He did not wish to pronounce dogmatically upon it. In principle he was rather in favour of that which was laid down in the clause, if it could be applied in such a way as not to cause great alarm. At the same time, it had created so much alarm among the owners of house property that he believed it would be desirable to postpone legislation on that part of the subject till next year. Another clause which he would also recommend the right hon. Gentleman to deal with in the same way was that as to the prison sites. There, again, he did not venture to speak dogmatically; there was much to be said on both sides; but the principle about to be adopted was an extremely novel one, and it might carry them much further than the particular cases now under consideration. In many parts of the country there was Crown property. The proposal made seven or eight years ago with reference to the Thames Embankment had been alluded to. There the property belonged to the Woods and Forests, and the principle adopted in that case was that the Crown in respect of property of that kind was justified in taking into account certain interests of the public, and in dealing with its property as private owners did. But it must be recollected that there was a large amount of Crown property throughout the country, and, therefore, that argument might carry them much further and lead to results of considerable importance. He would also remark that they were entirely without information as to the value of the property now proposed to be dealt with. Were the sites of Millbank and the other prisons really valuable sites or were they not? He had heard different opinions on that point. He had heard that Millbank was an extremely valuable site; that it would sell for a very large sum of money; and, if the principle proposed to be applied by the Bill were adopted, it might be that the difference between the selling value of the land and that for which it would be sold for the purposes of that Bill would probably be not less than £300,000 or £400,000. If that was the case, what they practically now asked to do was to give a subvention to the Metropolis of a sum to that amount. He could not but think that that was a very novel principle, and that it might give rise to claims on the part of other towns to be dealt with in the same way. On the other hand, if the value of the property was a small one, and the difference between the value of the site in the open market and the price to be obtained for it as a site for working class dwellings would not be considerable, the question might not be a very serious one. If that were the case, why could not the Metropolitan Board of Works—one of the most wealthy Local Authorities in the Kingdom—buy the property and give the full value for it, and not raise a question of that importance? All, however, that he said on the point at present was that it was one on which there was so much difference of opinion that he thought it would be well if the right hon. Gentleman would postpone that very contentious question till next Session. In conclusion, although the harvest at present might not be a large one, he hoped they might be allowed to gather it; but, as there were other questions not dealt with in that Bill which must come under the consideration of the Legislature at an early period, they might, he thought, leave to that period some of the contentious matter to which he had referred.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) said, that the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down agreed with the Mover of the Amendment in advising them to relegate at least one contentious question till next Session. The hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Lyulph Stanley) was anxious that they should not discuss the question of the housing of the poor until they had determined—first, the whole question of local burdens; secondly, what hon. Gentlemen called the land question; thirdly, the question of local government; and, fourthly, the question of leasehold tenure in towns. Was it to be seriously supposed that next Session would be a Session in which they would have a large amount of leisure to discuss those questions? He was quite prepared to leave to the next Parliament everything which it could most properly discuss; but if they could, by common agreement on both sides, do something material—he did not say how much—to improve the dwellings of the working classes, was it common sense to defer it until the whole catalogue of gigantic problems which the hon. Member for Oldham had desired them to discuss had been finally disposed of by the new Parliament? The hon. Member for Oldham seemed to think that everything would be put right if they only had a good system of local self-government. Now, he was as anxious for local self-government as the hon. Member; but let them constitute their Local Governing Bodies how they pleased, they would not always be ready to carry out the duties which Parliament desired to impose on them. The hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Broadhurst) thought the remedy for the existing evil was a good Leasehold Bill. Now, individually, he had a prejudice in favour of houses being built in towns on a tenure substantially equal to a freehold site. In Scotland, and in parts of Lancashire, that had been an habitual practice; but when he was told that overcrowding, insanitary dwellings, and all the other great social diseases with which that Bill was intended to cope, had their origin in the fact that a large part of the Metropolis was held under leases from ground landlords, he reminded the House that those evils existed in towns in this country and in other countries where the question of leases never arose, and, among other places, in Edinburgh, in Glasgow, in Paris, in Berlin, and in New York. The clause of this Bill dealing with prison sites had excited more controversy of a general kind than any other provision in it. The hon. Member for Stoke asked how they could justify handing over to that Metropolis a large grant of public property unless they were equally prepared to hand over to other local bodies and other towns grants of a like character? The hon. Member, in fact, said that he objected to handing over the unearned increment of rent to the ratepayers of the Metropolis. But, having said that, he went on to say that he did, after all, approve of the clause to a certain extent, because it recognized the principle that the unearned increment belonged to the people. Both those arguments could not be sound, and, therefore, it was for the hon. Member to choose between them. But, as a matter of fact, the introduction of the question of unearned increment into the treatment of this question was utterly irrelevant, and Mr. George's theories, whatever might be their value, had no relation to the Bill. He would not go into a justification of the clause in detail; but he would urge in particular this argument—that London was the place where most injury had been done to the working classes by displacements carried out under Act of Parliament, and London was also the one town in the United Kingdom where the greatest injury had been done to the working classes by compelling them to migrate. There was something, therefore, not altogether unfair in asking Parliament to partially undo the wrong Parliament itself had inflicted. Moreover, Pentonville was a national prison, and it occupied a site which practically threw much too great a burden on the taxpayers, and, therefore, the passing of this clause might be regarded as paying off what the country owed to London. These were the pleas on which he would recommend the House to accept the clause, which, at the same time, he frankly admitted was open in some points of view to severe criticism. The hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Jesse Collings) complained that the Bill did nothing whatever to diminish the pressure of rents. He altogether denied that. In the first place, the very clause he had been discussing had as its sole justification the fact that it would diminish the pressure of rents. It was grossly unfair to the framers of the Bill to say that nothing was done to diminish, to a certain extent, at all events, the pressure of rents upon those who were compelled to dwell in the neighbourhood of their work. He earnestly impressed upon the House the desirability of as soon as possible discussing the Bill in Committee. Most of the objections that had been taken to the Bill might, he thought, have been taken in Committee; and it would be a thousand pities, after the Royal Commission had reported, and a Bill had been introduced in the main in accordance with that Report, if the House were to spend any more time discussing the second reading at a period of the Session when time was doubly and trebly valuable.

Mr. FIRTH said, it was difficult to know whether the Bill was really the Bill of the Royal Commission or not. More Members of the Commission had spoken against the Bill than had spoken in favour of it; but, at the same time, the Bill certainly did carry out some of the recommendations of the Commission. He thought it was very necessary to get the provisions this Bill did give them. For the rest he was perfectly satisfied to wait until the next Election was over. As to the question of the unearned increment on these prison sites, it had always been the custom of Railway Companies to select the sites of the houses of working men for the purpose of laying out their lines, and to turn working men out without any sort of compensation, and the unearned increment of the prison sites was not a very large return for all that. Under the present law, where a man let an unfurnished house he was not liable for injury to health caused by bad sanitary arrangements; but that was not the case where the house was furnished. He entirely approved the proposal in the Bill that the owner of the house should be liable in such a case whether the house was furnished or unfurnished. He should have been glad to have seen several other of the recommendations of the Royal Commission embodied in the Bill; but inasmuch as the Bill, as far as it went, did advance the question a little, he should give it his hearty support. He would only add that he thought the result of the investigation by the Royal Commission had in many respects imperatively demonstrated the necessity that existed in London for a Central Municipal Authority.

Mr. W. M. TORRENS said, he hoped that the Bill would be read a second time; but he wished to give the Home Secretary one word of advice. Nothing was more dangerous than to overload a lifeboat, no matter what were the motives which prompted such a course. This Bill was a lifeboat, and he urged the right hon. Gentleman not to consent to the addition of any more clauses to it, as its very existence would thereby be imperilled. For himself, he would be glad if the Government could, consistently with their sense of duty, omit one or two clauses to which opposition had been offered. He desired to point out that the Royal Commissioners had steadily refused to enter into the general subject of London Government, and had confined their attention strictly to the question before them—namely, the better housing of the working classes of London. They in no way recommended that the unearned increment of the land should be given to the people, and they had not sought to deal with theoretical questions of the kind. This measure, therefore, must not be supposed to be intended as a first step towards the nationalization of the land, or towards creating a new Municipality for London. As to the proposal with respect to prison sites, of which he was the author, so far as the Commission was concerned, he should be delighted even if a brick was never laid on the sites. If there was one thing which the Metropolis required more than houses it was breathing ground for the people who had been crowded together by the action of Parliament, and he rejoiced at the prospect of those sinks of iniquity, the prisons affected by the Bill, being removed from among the people, and their sites appropriated either as open spaces or for the purpose of building dwellings for the working classes. In this matter it was neither practicable nor equitable to deal with

London like an ordinary town. London was the centre of the population and the industry of the Kingdom; it was annually attracting thousands of fresh inhabitants, and it was incumbent upon Parliament to deal with that which had become the greatest capital of the greatest Empire in the world on specific grounds and principles.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, that he had an appeal to make to the House. He trusted that they would now consent to read the Bill a second time, inasmuch as he intended to propose several Amendments in Committee to-morrow, the nature of which he would make known to the House on the Motion that the Speaker leave the Chair, and which he thought would meet many of the objections that had been made to the measure. They were very near the end of the Session, and there was still other Business to be got through. Hon. Members would have ample opportunity of discussing the measure to-morrow on the Motion for going into Committee.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, that after the appeal of the right hon. Gentleman he would not press his right to address the House upon the measure.

Mr. GRAY desired to state that, as a Member of the Commission, he did not object to the Bill. He was not of opinion that it would do much good, although it could not do much harm. He certainly thought that the enormous evil of the condition of the poor in large towns could not be dealt with by a Bill of such a kind.

Mr. BRYCE said, that he should not oppose the Bill being read a second time on the understanding that a debate could be raised on the Motion to go into Committee.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Main Question, "That the Bill be now read a second time," put, and *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) BILL [*Lords*].—[Bill 249.]

(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes), in moving that Mr. Speaker do leave the Chair, said, that the Government had undertaken, before the House went into Committee, to state the names of the Commissioners who would be appointed under it. The Government were anxious, inasmuch as the Bill dealt with the interests of both landlords and tenants, that the two Commissioners to be appointed under it should be, as far as possible, representative of the interests of those two parties. The question of who the Commissioners should be to whom the administration of the Bill should be intrusted had been a matter of earnest consideration on the part of Her Majesty's Government. After the most mature consideration, they were now in a position to submit to the House the names of two gentleman whose past career and acquaintance with the subject, as well as the knowledge which hon. Members possessed of them, would, he thought, entitle their choice to the approval of the House. Mr. John George M'Carthy was for many years a Member of that House. When the Land Act of 1881 came into operation he was appointed a Sub-Commissioner, and from that time up to the present he had been engaged in carrying out the Land Act of 1881. Though it was difficult to say that any gentleman had given entire satisfaction in the carrying out of that important measure, yet it would be admitted by everyone that Mr. M'Carthy, as far as it was possible to do so, had carried out the measure in a spirit of fairness and equity to all parties concerned. While he was justified in saying that Mr. M'Carthy's sympathies were with the tenants, yet he was sure that in carrying out this legislation he would do nothing that was not just. The second Commissioner it was proposed to appoint was Mr. Stanislaus Lynch, who had been a Registrar of the Landed Estates Court for many years, and in that position had had great experience in the transfer of properties. He was sure that his experience in that particular would be of great importance in carrying out the Act. Furthermore, for the last two or three years, Mr. Lynch had devoted himself to the question of the creation of a peasant proprietary, and had written upon that subject. Speaking for himself and for his Colleagues, they were of opinion that if the House adopted these names there would be no danger that the Act would not be carried out with efficiency, fairness, and equity.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*The Attorney General for Ireland.*)

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, it would, no doubt, be the desire of the Government, or of whatever Government happened to be in Office when the Bill was carried into effect, to carry it out, as the right hon. and learned Gentleman said, with efficiency, fairness, and equity. He wished to take that opportunity, which would probably be the last he should have before the Bill passed into law, of stating some misgivings he felt as to the soundness of the principle upon which the measure was based. He was well aware that the Bill was brought before the House with the assent of the leading statesmen on both sides of the House, and he was also aware that the part of a Cassandra was not a gracious nor a popular one either on the stage or off of it; but he could not help expressing his doubts and misgivings, after the experience he had obtained, as to whether the Bill would achieve the objects which it had in view, and, if it did achieve them, whether they would not be purchased at too dear a price. The principles on which the Bill was based appeared to him to be fraught with novelty. Almost for the first time they were called upon to sanction a measure by which it was proposed to invest the money of the taxpayers of the United Kingdom in loans to tenants in Ireland in order to enable them to purchase their farms on easy terms. He quite agreed that that principle had, to a certain extent, been acted upon in what were known as the Bright Clauses of the Land Act of 1881. But he would point out a very material distinction between those clauses and the present Bill. In the Act of 1881, and in previous Acts by which Parliament authorized advances to be made to the tenants out of the Church Surplus, for the purpose of enabling them to purchase their holdings, it was always provided that one-fourth should be paid down by the tenant in the first instance. In this Bill that provision had been altogether omitted. The proposal contained in the Bill was that nothing whatever was to be paid by the tenant, and that no security was to be taken from the tenant if he desired to purchase. He was not called upon to pay a single 1*d.*; but, on the contrary, a great, and, in his opinion, too great, a benefit was intended to be conferred upon the tenant in the shape of lowering the annual sum he would have to pay either in the way of rent or instalments of rent, and a large bonus was given to him in the future. It was quite true that the Bill proposed only to advance a sum of £5,000,000, and it might be said that that sum, as compared with the Expenditure of the country, was so trifling as to be a mere fleabite. This, however, was not a question of the advance of £5,000,000, but an experiment intended to be tried for the purpose of converting the ownership of land in Ireland into a peasant proprietary. If the Bill succeeded, and the landlords and tenants of Ireland availed themselves of the facilities given by the Bill, it would not be a question of £5,000,000, but the country would be called upon to advance £25,000,000, £50,000,000, or, it might be, £100,000,000, in order to enable the scheme which the Bill presented to the House to be carried out. He asked the House to consider what was the security offered for the large advances which the House was going to sanction out of the money of the taxpayers of the whole of the United Kingdom? They were told that the Bill provided that the Government should have the security of the land—a security of much the same kind as the landlord now had for his rent—and that there was a provision in the Bill by which one-fifth of the purchase money might be retained by the Land Commission. He ventured to say, however, that that security was absolutely illusory, because it was only permissive, because only one-fifth was to be retained; and, even if it were retained, it had to be given up as soon as the tenant had paid one-fifth of the purchase money, instead of being retained until the tenant had paid the whole of the purchase money, by which means something in the shape of real security would be given. As soon, however, as the tenant had paid the amount equal to one-fifth of the purchase money, the sum retained as security would be returned. So that this security was altogether illusory, and useless for the repayment of the whole of the advances which the State was asked to make. Then they were told that they had the security of the land itself; but that depended upon two factors — the first of which was the ability and willingness of the tenant to pay; and the second, and the most important, factor was the ability and willingness of the Government to enforce its powers as a secured creditor. He would ask the House to consider what would be the position of the tenant if the scheme contemplated by the Bill were carried into effect. The Bill provided that the tenant should pay an annuity calculated at 4 per cent on the purchase money, and extending over a period of 49 years. In that time it was calculated that he would have to pay the purchase money with 3 per cent interest; but the amount of interest was immaterial. He was told, and he believed it was generally accepted, that land sold for about 20 years' purchase; and if it sold at anything less than 25 years' purchase on the rent, the annuity which the tenant would pay would be less than the rent he was at present paying. Let him take the case of a tenancy in regard to which the rent was £50 a-year. At 20 years' purchase the purchase money would be £1,000. At 4 per cent interest, payable for 49 years, he would pay to the estate an annuity of £40 a-year, or, in other words, 20 per cent less than he would pay in the shape of rent, and at the end of 49 years the land would become his own, so that the position of the tenant would be much better by purchasing the land and being converted from a tenant into a proprietor. He would pay 20 per cent less than he was now paying in the shape of rent, and he would leave his successors in the possession of the land after 49 years. No wonder that the Bill had been called a generous Bill. Few proposals had ever been brought before Parliament of a more generous character. What they proposed to do was to make an immediate and most valuable present to the tenants of land in Ireland; but they made that present at the expense of the taxpayers of the United Kingdom. ["No!"] Yes; it was the taxpayers of the United Kingdom who were to advance this sum of £5,000,000 out of the Consolidated Fund for the purpose of enabling the tenants to become the owners of land on these easy terms. Did the House think that it would stop there, or that the demand would be confined to Ireland? Was it not certain that a demand would be made in that House to apply the same principle in other parts of the United Kingdom, the inhabitants of which were, in fact and in truth, called upon to contribute to the large sum which, if the Bill became a success, would require to be advanced out of the Consolidated Fund? If this money were an ordinary advance to be repaid, it might be said that the Consolidated Fund was in the position of the money lender who advanced his money and got a return of his capital with interest; but he had already pointed out that the only security the State would have was a security which would depend upon the ability and the willingness of the tenant to pay, and what he thought was much more important—namely, the ability and willingness of the State to enforce payment of the annuity. He would ask what would be the position of the State in respect of a tenant who purchased under the Act? Every lawyer and every hon. Member of that House knew that the State would be in the position of a mortgagee; and they understood the difference between the position of a mortgagee and of a landlord who let his land to a tenant at a rent. They could not expect the peasantry of Ireland to realize the difference between the position of the landlord who received £40 and the landlord who received £50 a-year; and inevitably the State would become, in substance and in fact, for a period of 49 years, as regarded those tenants who accepted these terms, in the position of landlord of the land in Ireland, and all the unpopularity and all the odium which attached to the position of a landlord in Ireland would henceforth attach to the State, and with accumulating force, because the State would have to bear the additional unpopularity which attached to the State when it demanded money. Many people thought, and it was generally believed, he was sorry to say, in this country, that the State was to be what had been described as a universal provider; and if the State attempted, in hard times, to enforce the payment of annuities, it would incur all the odium of a landlord demanding his rent, and, in addition, the odium of the State enforcing payment of money upon people who found it very difficult to pay. All he asked the House to consider was what the position of the State would be if they had another period of scarcity and of famine such as those which had from time to time visited Ireland when they had bad seasons and the crops had failed, and it became most difficult for the tenant to pay his rent. What would be the position of the Government then? How were they to enforce payment of these annuities? Would they propose to enforce it by eviction or by sale? If they enforced the payment of the instalments by the legal remedies of sale or eviction, were they going to enforce it at the point of the bayonet, or how were they going to enforce it? He ventured to predict that if times like those which they had passed through should, unhappily, pass over Ireland again, it would be difficult, nay, almost impossible, for the Government, with the best intentions in the world, to enforce regular payment when it was refused, and if the refusal became anything like universal it would be impossible to enforce the payment of annuities, which would represent the principal and interest of the advances. He would not say what power this would give to the agitator. The agitator against the legal rights of the landlord had made out a strong case, and the agitator against the legal rights of the landlord had aroused the passions of the people. But what a field there would be for the agitator when these annual payments—whether rents or annuities were perfectly immaterial—were to be paid, not to landlords or to individuals, but to the State! He looked forward with the greatest misgiving to the ability of the State to enforce these payments; and although, of course, on paper they would have a legal right to enforce them by eviction or sale of the holding, he ventured to anticipate that, notwithstanding the approval which the Bill had received from both sides of the House, there would be the greatest difficulty on the part of the State hereafter in enforcing payment of the annuity representing the principal and the interest of the advances. He was told that there was no doubt the tenant purchasing under the provisions of this Bill would pay his instalments of principal and interest. He said, with the utmost sincerity, that he hoped and desired that it might be so. Nothing would give him greater pleasure than to find that the misgiving and doubt which he could not help feeling as to the expediency of the Bill, and as to the precedents set by its provisions, were falsified. If the Bill became a success, and it were a means of establishing, with justice to all parties, and with justice to the State, which meant the people of the United Kingdom generally, a peasant proprietary in Ireland, and that peasant proprietary became a guarantee for order and good government in that country, nothing would give him greater pleasure than to find that the misgivings he entertained were falsified. He confessed that he should have liked the experiment to be tried which had been indicated, he believed, by the hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. T. A. Dickson)—namely, that of the establishment of a National Land Bank. He was told that it was the practice of the Irish tenants to invest their savings in the Irish banks, and if the deposits could be utilized for the purpose of adding to the public fund which it was intended to apply in this way, he believed that most valuable results would be secured, and for two reasons—first, the Irish people themselves would provide the money by which it was proposed to transfer the land in Ireland from the present holders to a peasant proprietary; and, in the next place, the savings of the Irish people would be invested in loans to the tenants for the purpose of enabling them to purchase their holdings. Consequently, every person who became a depositor or a borrower in such a bank as had been suggested, the funds of which were to be applied for this purpose, would be interested in maintaining the stability of the system, and in taking care that the instalments represented by the annuity were paid with reasonable regularity. He would have had much greater confidence in the success of the proposals intended to be carried out by the Bill if some scheme of that kind had been attached to the measure, than he had in a proposal to advance money out of the Consolidated Fund to the tenants in return for an annuity. He was well aware that in all probability the Bill would be carried into law with such Amendments as might be made in it in Committee, and he was well aware that the doubts and misgivings he had felt it his duty to express, in his place in Parliament, as to the soundness of the principle on which the Bill was based, and the probability of its success, would be nothing more than an ineffectual protest. He could only hope and desire—and he did so from the bottom of his heart—that the Bill might turn out to be all that the promoters of it wished, and that his misgivings might be altogether falsified—that the tenants would pay the annuities and instalments they would have to pay with reasonable regularity, and that the Bill would be the means of establishing an order of things in Ireland which would tend to the prosperity of the country.

MR. SINCLAIR said, that it had not been his intention to have obtruded himself upon the Committee; but after the speech of the hon. and learned Member for Christchurch (Mr. Horace Davey), and knowing, as he (Mr. Sinclair) did, that anything which came from such a quarter would receive not only great attention in that Committee, but also from the nation at large, he thought it was desirable to notice one or two points which, in his opinion, deserved attention at the hands of hon. Members before a measure of this kind passed into law. The hon. and learned Member had referred to the question of the security that was proposed to be given in one-fifth of the purchase money being retained in the hands of the Government until at least that proportion had been paid by the tenant, and the hon. and learned Gentleman had said that that was the only security which existed, given on account or behalf of the purchaser. That, however, was not exactly the case, at least, in the North of Ireland, because the tenant right that existed on the Northern farms was of very great value. In some cases, as was mentioned in the House on the second reading of the Bill, the tenant right amounted to more than the value of the fee simple, and that security, if he understood the provisions of the Bill aright, would remain in the hands of the Government until the entire amount of the advance was repaid. That, he thought, was a very fair and a very effectual security; and it would remain in the hands of the nation, in order that the public might be secured as to any money advanced with a view of carrying into effect the attempt now being made to institute a peasant proprietary in Ireland. Very little had been said during the debate as to the desirability and necessity of the creation of a peasant proprietary. It seemed to be conceded in all parts of the Committee that that was a most desirable thing to do, and he, therefore, would not detain hon. Members by entering into that part of the question; but he would accept, as an axiom agreed in by both sides, that it was a desirable thing to attain, if it could be attained in a right and proper manner. The Bill had been spoken of as a generous Bill, and there was no doubt that, to some extent, it was so; but it must be remembered that Ireland required generous treatment at the hands of England, and that this Bill was only an attempt to do some little good for the evil which had been done in the past. It was one of the efforts England was trying to make at the present time in order to undo some of the harm which, by bad government and bad legislation, she had inflicted in the past on that country. It must be remembered that, in order to be a success, the advantages of the Bill, and the method by which it was intend to benefit the tenant, must be brought home to the tenant—that was to say, to those whose labour had in the past been the means of creating the value of the land which now existed. It was not the landlord who had done that; but it had been by the hard work of the tenant that the value of the land had increased in the past and would increase in the future. He would not dwell upon the circumstance that the cultivation of the land in England was quite different from that adopted in Ireland. In Ireland the improvement of the land was entirely effected by the tenant, and that fact alone rendered any comparison between the two countries perfectly impossible. It was altogether impossible for the English tenants to put forward claims of the same character as those which the tenants in Ireland could put forward. He thought he was fairly entitled to ask, at that stage, for some information as to the way in which the sum of £5,000,000, to be advanced under the present Bill, was to be expended. Was it to be looked upon as a matter of political economy? He admitted that the

Bill sinned, to some extent, against the doctrines of political economy; but he understood that it was intended to be an advantage, not so much from the point of view of political economy, as from a national point of view. It was thought by means of this kind that something could be done to settle some of the questions that were troubling Ireland, and it was with a view of enabling a step to be made in the direction of securing peace, order, and prosperity in that country that the Bill had been introduced by Her Majesty's Government, and acceded to by hon. Members on both sides of the Committee. But there was no doubt that the advances which might be given would be very different in different localities; for instance, the security for the advance would be very much greater in the North of Ireland than it would be in the South. He thought, therefore, that he might fairly ask if the Government were going to make the priority of advance depend to any extent upon the security offered; or were they going to make the advances all over the country in the order in which the applications were made, looking upon them as a matter of State policy, without regard to the fact whether the security upon which the advances were made was great or small, the main point being to settle, as far as the Bill could, the greater security which would thus be provided for the future government of Ireland? Then, also, he should like to hear something from those who represented the Government on the subject of what were called the glebe tenants—those who had purchased under the Irish Church Act. It was well known by hon. Members that, under that Act, very considerable inducements had been held out to the tenants to purchase the land that they were in possession of, and a large number of them had taken advantage of those inducements. But the terms of purchase were by no means so advantageous as those which were proposed in the present measure. He (Mr. Sinclair) did not think it had ever been suggested from any quarter that any reduction should be made as to the principal sum paid for the farms originally purchased under the Irish Church Act. The sale had been effected long ago, and the purchase, at the time it was made, was considered to be a bargain, and it was then thought that no change was likely to be made in the terms under which land in Ireland might hereafter be obtained. He ventured to think that those who had purchased at that time, and whose terms of repayment were onerous as far as the interest was concerned, would have a fair claim to consideration under an Act such as this. It might be perfectly true that it was not an absolute case of justice requiring that change to be brought about; but it was one of those cases where it might truly be said that considerations of leniency ought to weigh with the Government in determining their course of action. Some remarks had been made by the hon. and learned Member for Christchurch in which reference was made to the Schedule connected with the Land Act. The hon. and learned Member had pointed out that the essence of this Bill was the payment of an annuity at the rate of £4 per annum upon a capital sum of £100, comprising both interest and principal, for a period of 49 years. He (Mr. Sinclair) thought that a considerable amount of misconception was likely to remain, so long as that Schedule was allowed to remain in its present shape, the principal and interest being included in one sum. Perhaps, for convenience, it was desirable that the payment should be so arranged; but he thought that the Schedule should be amended to this extent—that the interest and principal of each year should be separately and distinctly stated. As long as it was represented in one sum only, it would be looked upon as rent; but if it were divided, as he thought it ought to be divided, the tenant would better understand what it was he was paying, and any misconception would be avoided. In conclusion, he would thank the Committee for the courtesy with which they had listened to him on the first occasion upon which he had felt it necessary to address them.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. PLUNKET) said, he did not propose to follow the arguments of hon. Members who had spoken in the debate. He could understand that the hon. Member for Antrim (Mr. Sinclair), who spoke for the first time, should be desirous to express his sentiments. But he must make an appeal to hon. Members generally. He could not but think that almost all those who had an immediate interest in the Bill had already spoken on the second reading; and if they wished that the measure should pass they ought to remember that time was pressing, and that unless they got into Committee at once and made progress with the Bill its passage might be endangered. He was quite sure that, instead of making speeches at this stage, hon. Members could not do better than reserve any observations they might wish to make for the clauses of the Bill in Committee, and to make those observations as short as possible.

SIR GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that the right hon. and learned Gentleman spoke of those who had an immediate interest in the Bill. He did not admit that that immediate interest was confined to Irish Members. It was not an Irish Bill at all. The British taxpayer had an immediate interest in the Bill as well. He had listened with great pleasure to the warning which had been given by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Christchurch (Mr. Horace Davey). He thought, however, that his hon. and learned Friend had made one mistake when he said that the Bill was supported by statesmen on both sides of the House. It should be remembered that a statesman of the very greatest experience in the other House (Earl Spencer) had given a most serious and solemn warning as to the danger of the Bill; and another right hon. Gentleman who was a great authority upon the subject—the right hon. Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre)—had done the same thing in that House. It could not be said, therefore, with justice that statesmen on both sides of the House were in favour of the Bill, and he hoped the House would take warning before going further. One thing was admitted—namely, that it was a Bill for the relief of landlords. ["No!"] At any rate, it was a Bill to open the land market as it was called The tenants of Ireland, by the Liberal Administration of the past, had got almost all they could desire; and this was a Bill to enable the landlords of Ireland to sell their estates for sums which they could not otherwise expect to obtain. It was a Bill for the State purchase of the land of Ireland, and for rendering the land of that country saleable under more favourable terms. He hoped hon. Members would not be blind to the matter, and that they would not ignore the fact that it was a Bill to enable the State to purchase the land of Ireland from the landlords. It was merely the thin end of the wedge. If they passed a Bill for £5,000,000 now they would have a demand by-and-by for £20,000,000, £50,000,000, £100,000,000, aye, and for £200,000,000. Although by reading this Bill a second time they were only pledging themselves to an advance of £5,000,000, these consequences would follow. Personally, he would not oppose the Bill if he was assured that this was to be merely an experiment, and that the credit of Parliament was to be pledged for £5,000,000 and no more. He was only afraid that in Committee pressure would be put upon the Government from so many sides that they would be induced to give way. There had been extreme anxiety on the part of the Irish Members to know who the Land Commissioners under the Bill were to be. No doubt a great deal depended upon that. If they had liberal Land Commissioners who would not take a petty peddling view, but a liberal view of matters, and would not be too strict about the security, things would go on to the satisfaction of the Irish Representatives. He admitted that the security in the North of Ireland was fair in a financial point of view; but from a political point of view it was a very shaky security indeed. But, be that as it might, he desired to point out that such high authorities as Earl Spencer and the right hon. Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had distinctly warned the House as to the probable operation of the Bill. As he had stated, he had no objection to expend £5,000,000 of the money of the British taxpayers in an experiment. He knew that the Imperial Parliament often voted £5,000,000, if not more, with a light heart for wars; and if in this case it ended in conferring advantages upon Ireland he should not complain. He had had a Notice down upon the Paper upon the second reading of the Bill, but had refrained from moving it. He had, however, been anxious to say these few words; and if the Government stood to their colours, and thought the security for the £5,000,000 was a fair and reasonable one, he had no desire to oppose the Bill. What he was anxious for was that the matter should be treated not entirely as an Irish question only; and he wished to add his voice to the warning which had been given by his hon. and learned Friend the Member for Christchurch (Mr. Horace Davey). There were Irish Representatives in all parts of the House; and with no half-past 12 o'clock Rule in force, with Irishmen on that side of the House, Irishmen on the other, and Irishmen below the Gangway, he was afraid that such pressure might be put upon the Government that they might find it prudent to yield, and in that way all sorts of objectionable provisions might be put into the Bill, the evil effect of which it might not be easy to obviate at the fag-end of the Session. He therefore thought the House ought to know that, in going into Committee upon the Bill, the liability of the taxpayers would be limited to the £5,000,000 now proposed to be advanced, and that the British taxpayer would not be pledged beyond the four corners of the Bill.

Mr. BRYCE said, he was afraid there was no use in opposing the Bill at that stage, especially when it had not only the support of the Government, but that of the Chiefs of the Opposition and of the Leaders of the Irish Party; but it was a pity that a Bill of this great importance, which raised such large questions, should come on for discussion in so thin a House at the end of the Session. The hon. Member for Antrim (Mr. Sinclair) alleged the Bill to be contrary to the principles of economy. He (Mr. Bryce) did not oppose it because it was opposed to sound principles of political economy, or on the ground pointed out by the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) that it was an imposition upon the British taxpayer, but because he believed that it involved great political dangers because it would make Great Britain the mortgagee of the land of Ireland. Nothing could be more calculated to aggravate the difficulties which existed between the two countries. Nobody was more anxious than he was to see a peasant proprietary established in Ireland, and nobody would be more glad to see that done by a local Irish Parliament. But if they were to spend English money for such a purpose it would be better to part with the money as a gift rather than as a loan. In the past the great evil had been that in Ireland there was a sense of exasperation against landlords, and particularly against absentee landlords; and the Bill was going to make the English Government the absentee landlord of the land of Ireland. Nothing could be more calculated to raise up future difficulties, to increase exasperation, and to prevent the bringing about of pacific and friendly relations between the two countries than a Bill of this kind. A possible mitigation was that in the next Session of Parliament they would create a large and liberal system of local government for Ireland, giving large powers, and that they would transfer this fund from the Imperial Exchequer to the Irish local bodies. That would, perhaps, be the best remedy for the danger which the House was now incurring.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he had no intention to detain the House, nor would he repeat any of the arguments which he had used a few nights ago; but he wished to take that opportunity of noticing the charges of inconsistency which had been brought against him by the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) in answer to his speech, which he ventured to think had its origin in the controversies of some years ago, the memories of which he had hoped had passed away. He altogether disclaimed the charge of inconsistency brought against him by the right hon. and learned Gentleman. Wherever he had written or spoken upon this subject he had always spoken in the same language which he used the other night. In the Committee in 1878, and later in an article in *The Nineteenth Century*, in commenting upon the question, he had used the same language. Although most anxious to assist operations for the creation of a peasant proprietary, he had pointed out the danger of offering terms which would amount to a bribe to tenants to become owners on terms of such a nature that they would pay less in the shape of interest and instalments of the principal than they would otherwise pay in the shape of rent. He had always pointed out that two classes of tenants could not co-exist, the one paying rent for ever, and the other paying less than their previous rent for a limited term of years. That was an element of considerable danger, greater to the landlords than to any other class in the country. For his part, he fully recognized the very grave difficulties in which the landlords were placed at that moment by the unsaleable condition of the land they owned. Yet he believed that in their interests it would be wiser for them, for the present, to submit to these hardships rather than enter into a transaction like that now before the House, by which they offered such great inducements to the tenants to become owners, and such conditions as would be fraught with future danger. He looked upon the Bill, however, as a tentative measure, and as one limited to the advance of the sum of £5,000,000. Regarding it in that light, and reserving the important question which it raised for future discussion, he should not oppose it, and he would not detain the House longer on this question.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Short title).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Sir William Hart Dyke) said, he would suggest to the Committee that as this Bill contained so much legal matter it would be better to leave it in charge of his right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland.

Motion *agreed to.*

Advances by the Land Commission.

Clause 2 (Advances to tenants under this Act).

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, that he had an Amendment to propose in this clause in line 11; but he would postpone it until after the Amendment of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had been disposed of.

Mr. SEXTON moved the omission of the first part of Sub-section (*a*), which provided that with respect to advances under the Act the Land Commission may—

"If the repayment of the advance is secured by a deposit under this Act (herein-after referred to as a guarantee deposit), and if the Land Commission are satisfied with the security in other respects,"

make an advance to a tenant who was purchasing his holding, of the whole principal sum payable by the tenant instead of the three-fourths mentioned in Part V. of the Act of 1881. As to the last words, "the Land Commissioners are satisfied with the security in other respects," he considered them to be mere verbiage. Of course, the Land Commissioners would not make an advance if they were not satisfied with the security. They would be idiots if they did, and, whatever might be said of the two gentlemen whose names had been mentioned that evening by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland in other respects, that could not be said of them. Where the Land Commission purchased an estate for the purpose of re-selling it to the tenants it appeared to him that the landlord would pocket the whole of the purchase money, and the tenants would be asked to guarantee the repayment of the advances themselves, and if they were asked to provide the guarantee they would have to borrow the money, because there was very little capital possessed by tenants in Ireland themselves, and they would have to pay 6 or 7 or 10 per cent for it, while they would only receive from the Land Commission 3 per cent. The tenant would, therefore, lose the difference between 3 and 8 or 10 per cent. If he got somebody else to guarantee the money the same thing would happen, because the tenant would have to give a guarantee to the guarantor; and therefore he thought that in regard to the purchase of estates by the Land Commission the provisions of the Bill in reference to the advance of the whole of the purchase money would simply be illusory, and really mean only the advance of four-fifths of the purchase money. The tenant would have to provide the other fifth; and, therefore, the difference between this and the Act of 1881, or a difference of 1-20th, which was totally inadequate, and very little more generous than the previous measures which had failed, would be useless, unless the Government were able to say that when the Land Commission bought an estate from a landlord and sold it to the tenant they would not require the same guarantee as in other cases. He wished to know how the scheme was going to work, because the provisions in regard to the security were embarrassing? In the first place, the State had the security of the holding itself. Then it was to have the security of the guarantee of one-fifth of the purchase money; and, in the third place, they were to have the security of the Irish Church Surplus. What was it that the Land Commission was to make an advance to buy? Was it not the interest of the landlord in the estate? What security the holding gave him would be given to the State, who would have the consolidated interests of both landlord and tenant? In Ulster, certainly, the interest of the tenant was much more valuable than that of the landlord; and in other parts of Ireland, also, it was of considerable value. Everywhere in Ireland it was worth something. Everywhere in Ireland it afforded to the State, in respect of the money advanced, a reasonable and an ample margin. That being so, he failed to see why the State should require, or even desire, anything beyond the security afforded by the holding. Would the right hon. and learned Gentleman tell the Committee why the security combining two interests—the interest of the landlord and the interest of the tenant—should not be a sufficient security for the purchase money advanced for the purchase of the interest of the landlord only? He wished to say, emphatically, before they went further with the Bill, that there was no sound basis on which the purchase could be effected except the basis that was afforded by fixing the purchase money at a fair and equitable rent, having regard to the prices of produce. The Land Commission ought to bear in mind what had been the recent course and prospects of agricultural prices in estimating the value of a holding. If they bore those facts in mind, and made the purchase money and the resulting instalments coincide with those conditions, the State had nothing to fear; but if that safe rule were departed from he would tell the Government that no collateral security would be of the slightest avail, because, if the purchase money were too high, the payment of the instalments would become intolerable. There would, consequently, be a considerable failure of payments, and there would be such a strain upon the guarantee securities, and on the surplus of the Church Fund, that no security would be of avail. He therefore told the Government frankly at the outset that the only real security they had was to make the purchase money a fair and equitable rent. He objected to the two other securities—namely, the guarantee deposit and the value of the holding, because the direct tendency and the inevitable result would be to make the purchase money unfair. Would the guarantee deposit be used up before the holding was sold or not? The 3rd clause of the Bill seemed to him to have been drafted by some prentice hand. As he read it, the guarantee deposit would not be used until the Land Commissioners declared by order that the sum overdue by the tenant was an irrecoverable debt. Now, he presumed that they could not declare a sum due by anybody to be an irrecoverable debt until they first tried to recover it, and one of the sub-sections of Clause 4 gave the Land Commissioners the power of mortgagees. He presumed it was pretended that they should proceed to sell the whole of the holding as soon as they made up their mind that the money could not be had. What was the meaning, then, of the words in this clause as to the repayment of the advances being secured by a guarantee deposit, and the satisfaction of the Land Commission with the security in other respects, and what was the meaning of the words in Clause 3 which entitled the Land Commission to apply the guarantee deposit in discharge or reduction of an irrecoverable debt? Surely the State would have already sold up the tenant, and he would have no longer any interest in the holding; and, therefore, what was the use of declaring that the interest in the holding of the person liable to pay the purchase money should be charged in favour of the person entitled to the guarantee deposit? How could they charge the tenant with anything if they sold him out? He would no longer have any place in the transaction; and, upon the other hand, he wanted to know whether it was meant to charge the guarantee deposit upon the incoming purchaser? If it were so they would revive the landlord institution in a most offensive and intolerable shape, and they would introduce a state of things which would not settle the Land Question or ease the government of Ireland, but would leave the question in a worse position than that which it now occupied.

If they wished to sell the whole holding what would happen? They could only use the guarantee deposit at all up to the time that one-fifth of the advances were paid. Did that mean—for it was not quite clear—that when the tenants' instalments reached one-fifth of the purchase money they were to be paid one-fifth of the capital, because, in that case, that result would not be arrived at for about 13 or 14 years? If they had to do without the guarantee deposit for the last three-fourths of the 49 years, they might as well do without it in the first one-fourth also. The guarantee deposit could only be applied during the short period which would elapse until the instalments paid, including capital and interest, were equal, and one-fourth of the purchase money would not be adequate to meet the irrecoverable debt falling within the period, during which the money could be recovered. The guarantee deposit could only be a scapegoat, and they would have to sell the land. Therefore, they might as well do that at first as at last. He failed to see any logic in having two securities, both of which were inadequate. The guarantee deposit would injure the landlord, cripple the tenant, and prejudice the State. Why did it injure the landlord? In nearly every case land was very heavily encumbered, almost up to the income derived from it so far as those persons were concerned who were likely to take advantage of the Bill. And what would happen? These men were men in regard to whom one-fifth of the guarantee deposit would about represent their interest in the land. The class of encumbered landlords in Ireland were really a class of persons who did not own more than one-fifth of their own lands. The other four-fifths belonged to those who held the encumbrances, and they might as well tell the landlord that he might come in at the Day of Judgment. He would only become desperate and say that the Bill was of no use at all, seeing that it would put no money into his hands, and that he would be obliged to stay as he was until the encumbrances left him not an inch of standing ground. So far as he was concerned he would avail himself of the Bill, and strain every nerve to screw up the purchase money to the highest possible pitch. If, for instance, the purchase money amounted to £1,000, the landlord would only get £800; and he would use every effort, by inducement and compulsion—such as appealing against the decision of the sub-Courts, or by putting a price upon the turf or bog, as would enable him to run up the purchase money to £1,200 or £1,500, so that the four-fifths he might receive would amount to £1,000. The effect of that upon the tenant was quite clear. The tenant would have to pay an annual instalment much too heavy for his means; and he (Mr. Sexton) would beg the attention of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to the direct effect the operation of this guarantee deposit would have. The effect of these collateral securities in the shape of a guarantee deposit and a Church Surplus Fund would encourage the landlords to run up the purchase money to the highest possible pitch; but if they had to fall back upon the security of the holding they would be careful as to what the price was. The Government might depend upon it that the adoption of this part of the clause would only encourage the landlords in using the many means they possessed of putting pressure upon the tenants. The clause as it stood would have the effect of running up the purchase money too high, and generally of placing it at a figure which the tenants would be unable to pay. He would, therefore, move the omission of these words, because he believed that the admission of this security as part of the scheme would embarrass the landlord, injure the tenant, and prejudice the State itself.

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 17, after the word "may," leave out to the word "make," in line 20.—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, there was no doubt that if the Government acceded to the Amendment of the hon. Member, and to the consequential Amendments, the object of the Bill would probably be facilitated. If the vendor on the one hand, and the intending purchaser on the other, were the only persons to be considered there might be no objection to the proposal; but it must be borne in mind that there was a third interest of great importance in the matter, and that the State had also to be considered, and he thought it would be wholly impossible for any responsible Minister of the Crown to submit to Parliament a proposition that £5,000,000 should be advanced for the purpose of enabling tenants to purchase their holdings unless Parliament was satisfied that adequate security was given for the repayment of the money. Although from 1870 down to the present time various propositions had been made to enable tenants to purchase their holdings, in every instance the proposition had carried with it terms which would enable something like adequate security to be given. The Act of 1870 only enabled two-thirds of the purchase money to be advanced. The Act of 1881 increased the proportion from two-thirds to three-fourths, and in the Bill introduced last year by the right hon. Member for the Border Burghs (Mr. Trevelyan) there was another form of security proposed to be given to the State—namely, the security of a local guarantee. It would be impossible to expect that the present Bill would be carried through Parliament unless there was an adequate guarantee for the money which it was proposed to advance. The hon. Member had suggested that the holding itself would be a sufficient guarantee provided that the purchase money was on a reasonable basis, inasmuch as it would consist not merely of the landlord's interest to be sold, but likewise of the interest of the tenant previously existing in the holding. It was true that the rules governing tenant right in Ireland set the ordinary law, and even the doctrines of political economy, at defiance; but experience taught them that the value of an estate was not increased by the double interest—that was, by adding the price of the tenant right to the value of the fee simple. Therefore, when they looked at the guarantee which a holding gave, they must regard it simply as the value of the holding in the possession of the landlord at the present time. That might appear to be a startling proposition; but it was undoubtedly a true one—namely, that the owner of land in his own hands would receive but a very small sum more than he would receive for the interest that he could sell under the provisions of the Bill. Would a guarantee regarded simply as the value of a holding in the possession of the landlord at the present time be a sufficient security? He agreed with the hon. Member that under ordinary circumstances it would be; but, at the same time, they must bear in mind that if every care was taken to make the price a fair and equitable one in the year in which the contract was entered into, the state of agriculture and other things might change in the course of a year or two, and then it might be impossible to realize that price. In such a case the State must look to some guarantee similar to that which was imposed by this Bill. The framers of the Bill believed that the variation in value would never be greater than one-fifth, and, therefore, that figure had been named; but beyond that point he thought it would be impossible for them to go. The hon. Member had asked how this guarantee was to be worked out. He thought he could satisfy the Committee that it could be worked out in a fair and reasonable way, and he asked the attention of the Committee while he offered an explanation. Any person might give the guarantee; but in almost every case it must come from the vendor—namely, the landlord, who must be prepared to allow one-fifth of the purchase money to remain in the hands of the Land Commissioners until a sum equal to that one-fifth was paid up by the tenant.

Mr. SEXTON asked whether he did that by selling his estate?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he would come to that point presently. Under ordinary circumstances, the person from whom the guarantee would come would be the landlord himself; and he must be prepared, before he and the tenant agreed to take advantage of this Bill, to allow that fifth to remain in the hands of the Land Commissioners. But it must be borne in mind that during that time the money would not be lying without its return to the landlord, to whom interest on it at the rate of 3 per cent would be payable. Moreover, the one-fifth deposited in the hands of the Land Commissioners was a security on which the landlord could raise money, as he could in the case of any other security in land; and, no doubt, he would be able to negotiate that security in the open market, and realize its fair value.

In case of default, the first thing the Land Commission had to do under this Bill was to realize, as far as possible, the sum due to the State by the sale of the holding. The amount could not be declared irrecoverable until efforts had been made to recover it, and by the terms of this clause the Commissioners were bound to put in force the ordinary powers of mortgagees for the purpose of realizing. If those powers were put in force, and the result was to realize the entire amount due, there would be no necessity to resort to the deposit; but if the amount fell short, as it might do, under certain circumstances, recourse would be had to the deposits. The hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had called attention to the 3rd clause, by which, under certain circumstances, power was given to the Land Commissioners to retain the guarantee deposit until a sum equal to the deposit had been repaid. At any time during the period for which the Land Commissioners were authorized to retain the guarantee deposit any sum due in respect of an advance secured by a guarantee deposit might be declared to be an irrecoverable debt. In that case the Land Commission might apply the guarantee deposit in discharge or reduction of such an irrecoverable debt. The meaning of that was that when the Land Commission sold for the purpose of realizing the amount that was due the purchaser would naturally demand a free discharge, and for this purpose it would be necessary to declare the deposit forfeited. That appeared to him to be just and fair. The hon. Member stated that it would have a tendency to raise the price above what would be fair and just, and he had instanced an estate which, in an ordinary case, would be sold for £1,000, being sold for £1,250. There might be something in that argument if the landlord were to fix the price at which the estate was to be sold. But that was not so. The price must be negotiated, in the first place, between the landlord and tenant—the vendor and purchaser—and then, if the two parties agreed, there was a third party which must also give its consent, and that was the Land Commission. Therefore, there was not the least danger of supposing that the estate would fetch more than the price it would fetch in the open market. The hon. Member had asked him what the consequences would be if the Land Commission purchased an entire estate from the owner for the purpose of re-selling to the tenants. It appeared to him that the Land Commission would never be justified in purchasing an entire estate unless they were perfectly certain that the greater number of the tenants were ready to purchase their holdings. If that were so the Land Commission would then make terms, and they would undoubtedly say—"If you sell to us, one of the terms of the contract must be that you will allow one-fifth of the purchase money to remain in our hands." Under no other circumstances would they be in a position to deal with the matter. It was quite clear that from first to last the tender must come from the landlord; and, that being the case, it would make no difference whether the Land Commission purchased the entire estate or not, and then endeavoured to negotiate with the tenants. It was wholly impossible for the Government to abandon their contention that the amount advanced must be ultimately paid in full, and it must be borne in mind that the State was taking this exceptional step for the benefit not only of the landlord, but of the tenant.

MR. WALKER said, it was very material to consider under what circumstances the land would be sold—whether the entire estate was purchased or not. It struck him, on consideration, that the clause would only operate where the entire purchase money was advanced by the State, and where the landlord was willing and able to sell. He thought that reasonably followed. The entire purchase money could only be advanced where a guarantee existed. He could not agree with what had fallen from his right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland with regard to the deposit by the landlord in cases where the Land Commission bought the estate. There was no provision in the Bill for that purpose, and he did not see how they could leave that matter to the mercy of the Commissioners. It would only be where the landlord was a solvent seller that the question of the deposit of one-fifth could arise; and, further, it could only arise where he was willing. Now, he could not be willing unless he was able, and in every case where property was encumbered fully, of course, he was not able, because it was the property of another person, and, therefore, he could not be said to be willing. Therefore, it was only in the case of a solvent estate that this could happen. The result was that they could only deal with cases where the landlord was both willing and able to do it; and the only case where he would do it was when the market was in that condition that he would sell, even if at a loss. He thought the clause could only work in the case of a landlord willing to sustain a loss, and, except in that case, he feared that it would have very little operation indeed.

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland had spoken of the possibility of the deposit of the landlord being a security on which he could raise money. But he ventured to doubt that he would be able to make use of that, for who would lend money for a moment on a security which, owing to the tenant not paying up his instalments, might be snapped up by the Commissioners at any moment?

Mr. HEALY said, that in his judgment this provision was utterly illusory, and instead of doing good either for the tenants, the State, or the landlord, it would do them a distinct mischief. Furthermore, he considered that by fixing the amount of loans by the limit of £5,000,000 the Government would thereby restrict the sale of land to the most undeserving class of persons. The Government wanted to do something to settle the Irish Land Question, and yet by this provision they were going to confine the operation of the Bill to rich graziers, large farmers, and people who did not deserve it. Those were the people whom the Government wanted to content, because, as a matter of fact, they were the only class who could get the one-fifth; the other class were practically excluded from purchasing the land. The Commissioners would be bound to have regard to the character of the purchasers; and when an estate was to be sold, out of the numerous applicants to purchase the Land Commissioners would be obliged to sell to the most eligible persons—that was to say, to those who could give the best security. Therefore, he said that the Government would exclude from the healing operation of the Bill the very class that it was desirable to include. As the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) had pointed out, if this one-fifth guarantee were insisted on by the State, they would compel the tenant to raise money from a bank at a high rate, and that would compel him to offer a lower price than the landlord would take. The clause, therefore, offered no advantage to the landlord. It was no advantage to the State, because it would not settle the Irish Land Question, and it was, for the reasons shown, of no advantage to the tenant. The clause, therefore, would do them all a distinct mischief by preventing the Bill working in a satisfactory manner. For those reasons he hoped the Amendment would be pressed on the Committee.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he could, of course, understand the reason for providing in the Bill for this guarantee; but, at the same time, he thought there was great force in the suggestions of hon. Members below the Gangway, that it would impede the operation of the Act, because the landlord would endeavour to recoup himself for whatever burden was in this way imposed upon him. The right hon. and learned Attorney General for Ireland had given as a reason for requiring the security of this deposit that the value of the fee simple would not be increased from the point of view of security by taking into account the tenant's interest in the land. He did not profess to put himself in opposition to the great authority of the right hon. and learned Gentleman on this subject; but he had always been under the impression that land in hand in Ireland fetched a very high price, because it included both the landlord's interest and the tenant's interest. He remembered that a good deal of evidence had been given before the Committee which considered the Land Question on this subject, and that it was pointed out that land unburdened with a tenant often fetched as much as 40 years' purchase of the assumed value. Then, if that were the case, the security offered by annexing the tenant right to the fee of the land would not be less than the security of two separate interests—namely, the tenant's interest and the fee of the land; and in that view he thought there was no necessity for this guarantee security as between the State and the tenant purchaser. The danger was not as regarded individual tenants, but as regarded a movement on the part of the tenants generally. For his part, he should be disposed to recommend that the guarantee security should be abandoned; but he would couple the suggestion with the recommendation that the term within which the instalments were to be made should be reduced. He did not know whether that would meet the views of hon. Gentlemen below the Gangway. He did not propose that the rate of interest should be increased, but only that the term of repayment should be shortened. Looking at the question broadly, he thought that the effect of the clause would be to increase the sum which the landlord would demand from the tenant-purchaser; and although it was true that the Land Commissioners would be in the position of arbitrators between landlord and tenant, yet if the landlord and tenant were to agree to certain terms, he did not see how the Land Commissioners could refuse to allow the transaction to proceed upon such terms.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. PLUNKET) said, the Amendment of the hon. Member for Sligo was a very serious one, and as such should be considered very carefully by the Committee before it was agreed to. It evidently went to the root of the whole scheme as it was drawn. He had listened to the speech of his right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland, which appeared to him to be absolutely conclusive on the question. It had been assumed from the first that it was not possible for the State, in its attempt to create a peasant proprietary in Ireland, to advance the purchase money of the land without security of some kind or other. He was, therefore, somewhat surprised to hear the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) recommending that the Government should give up all the security proposed in the Bill by way of guarantee. That which really wrecked the Bill of the late Government was that they required a guarantee that it was impossible to provide. The present Government, however, had substituted in this Bill another guarantee for a definite purpose, and at that period of the Session it seemed to him to be a perfectly illusory and wild idea to recommend to the public opinion of the country, which had been strained far enough already, a scheme which would be a departure from all precedents and theories formerly propounded—that was to say, to ask the taxpayers of the country to advance the whole of the purchase money without having any guarantee whatever. He must put it in fairness to the right hon. Gentleman opposite to say why he did not suggest the propriety and safety last year, when the Bill of the late Government was before the House, of advancing all the money without guarantee or security when the adoption of such a course would have cleared away all the difficulty so far as hon. Members from Ireland were concerned. He did not think it necessary for him to press that argument further. As to calculating the exact proportion of the value of the tenant right, and the value of the landlord's interest, and how much each should bear to the whole value of the land, he must say that the calculation was one which it would be almost impossible to make. Hon. Gentlemen from the North of Ireland would know that nothing varied in that part of Ireland so much as the value of the tenant right in respect of land. He submitted that it was not a fair way of viewing this proposal of the Government to say that this requirement, that every landlord should leave one-fifth of the purchase money in the hands of the State, was put into the Bill for the purpose of making the market high and inducing the tenant to offer a price that he could not afford to pay. If they were to safeguard the interests of the State there must be a margin somewhere, and he thought that the Government had hit upon a plan which afforded that margin, which would enable the Land Commissioners with safety to the State to give neither more nor less than a fair price to the landlord; and he was sure that there was no Party in that House which would wish to see the landlord robbed of any part of the fair price of his land. He believed that there was great truth and force in what had been stated in an Irish newspaper—namely, that there was not the least fear that the tenants in Ireland would give more than a fair price for the land. Therefore, before the Committee threw out this part of the clause, he thought they ought very carefully to consider the matter, because if by any chance division it was left out it would effect an entire change in the scheme of the Bill, and plunge the whole question again in extreme difficulty before the country.

MR. T. A. DICKSON said, he believed that if the words proposed by the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) were agreed to the Bill would prove illusory and unworkable. He did not propose that the Land Commissioners should advance all the money, or even three-fourths of it on application, but that the question whether they should advance three-fourths or one-half should be left to their discretion. He thought it should be left to them to make such an advance as they thought would be covered by the fee-simple and the tenant right. He knew a case in which it would be safer to advance the whole sum than the half of it. In the county of Antrim recently there were cases in which the relative prices had been as follows:—Fee-simple 18 years, tenant right 39 years; fee-simple 21 years, tenant right 45 years; and fee-simple 29 years' purchase, tenant right 49 years' purchase. Was there anyone who would say that in making advances to the tenant, when the value of the tenant right was equal to, and in some cases double the value of, the fee-simple, that there was any risk whatever? He said—"Do not advance the whole, or even three-fourths of the money, but trust to the Commissioners, who were responsible to the Treasury." If the Bill was to work it could only be made to work by giving ample discretion to the Commissioners, who would be under the control of the Treasury, and who would take care that not more than the proper sum was advanced. This Bill was by all regarded as an experiment, and the amount advanced could not exceed the £5,000,000 named in the clause. When that was exhausted Parliament would be applied to for another £5,000,000 or £10,000,000; but in the meantime they would have had experience of the working of the Act. It appeared to him that they were continuing in this Bill the mistakes made in former Acts, the Purchase Clauses of which had turned out to be failures. When they had this splendid opportunity of testing this question, and creating peasant proprietorship in Ireland, he asked if the Government would not make a bold experiment and leave the question of advancing three-fourths or the whole of the purchase money to the discretion of the Commissioners whom they had appointed?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Sir, after the speech of my right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland, which in our opinion thoroughly met the case put forward by the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), it will be necessary for me to detain the Committee but a very short time. I am bound to say that Her Majesty's Government look upon this guarantee deposit as a matter of supreme importance to the Bill, and that we have proposed it in place of the guarantee proposed by the late Government. We do not think in justice to the British taxpayers—and in that name I would include the taxpayers of Ireland as well as of the other parts of the United Kingdom—that we ought to advance the whole value of the holding without some guarantee. That guarantee we have endeavoured to take in a form which appears to us to offer the least possible hindrance to the carrying out of this plan. We have proposed that for no long term of years a sum equal to one-fifth of the purchase money of the holding should remain in the hands of the Commissioners on condition that the depositor shall receive 3 per cent interest, as much as he would get in the Funds, and with as great security; and at the end of the term, if the instalments are paid up, he will be entitled to the amount deposited. It is all very well to talk about the double security which the Government would have in the fee-simple and tenant right. That, no doubt, would be the case with such holdings as the hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. T. A. Dickson) has spoken of; but, as my right hon. and learned Friend has shown by the last Report of the Land Commission, it is perfectly clear that there are holdings in Ireland to which the Act would, undoubtedly, apply in which there would be no such double security—because the value has so deteriorated that there would be no tenant right, for even the fee-simple has been deteriorated by the neglect of the tenant. We have been told that the Land Commissioners would guard the interest of the Treasury in this matter, and consequently the taxpayers of the country. But, Sir, we cannot consent to leave it to them. We think there ought to be in this case, as Parliament has always before required a margin of security beyond the value of the holding at the time of purchase, not only to make up for the deterioration I have alluded to, but also for the bad seasons which may occur. I have heard from many hon. Gentlemen connected with Ireland that this is a very liberal proposal. I think that an hon. Gentleman opposite spoke of it as a great bribe; but I can tell the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) that it is more liberal than anything which he, as a Member of the late Government, ever ventured to propose, and yet he now comes down and asks us to omit the chief security of the Bill. I venture to say that we must adhere to this proposal of a guarantee deposit; and if hon. Members want the Bill to pass this Session, and be, as I hope it may be, an experiment of great value and importance to Ireland, I must ask them to leave this provision in the Bill. We think it of the greatest importance, and at the same time a reasonable proposal, as between the taxpayers of the United Kingdom and those whom the Bill is intended to benefit.

Mr. VILLIERS STUART said, he hoped the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) would not persist with his Amendment. Of course, as a landlord, he would rather receive the whole amount of the purchase money than four-fifths of it, still he could not shut his eyes to the fact that if the Amendment were carried the Bill would be shipwrecked to the detriment of peasant proprietorship in Ireland.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, he was glad to perceive that Her Majesty's Government intended to stand to their guns in this matter. He agreed with the hon. Gentleman who had just spoken that if the Amendment were accepted the whole structure of the Bill would go. He said that they ought to take such security as a prudent banker would require.

Colonel KING-HARMAN could not see the great liberality of the Bill. The Bill of the late Government proposed to advance three-fourths of the money—that was 15-20ths. This Bill proposed to advance 16-20ths, 1-20th more, and for that 20th a guarantee was to be taken from the Church Fund, which amounted to £750,000—a guarantee of £750,000 for £250,000.

Mr. GRAY thought that after the speech of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer it would be prudent for the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) not to press his Amendment to a division. After all, it was the Government who were responsible for this Bill; and if, in spite of warnings and forebodings, the Bill was found not to work satisfactorily on account of the Government insisting upon this guarantee, the blame could not fall upon the hon. Member for Sligo. In fact, the Attorney General for Ireland himself, and the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket), had acknowledged that the effect of the clause would be really what they (the Irish Members) said. He (Mr. Plunket) put it that the effect would be to secure to the landlords what he called a fair price, which they would not otherwise get. The Irish Members, however, thought the effect of it would be to compel the tenant to pay an excessive price without giving the landlord any corresponding advantage. The conclusion was the same—namely, to enhance the price. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer said the landlord would remain out of his money for a short time; the Chief Secretary said 10 years. There was no doubt about that. As a matter of fact, it would be 15 years or 16 years that he would have to remain out of his money, because it would take that period to repay that part of the advance. The fifth would be paid in a shorter term. It was acknowledged that this Bill was a Bill to relieve the deadlock caused by the impoverished landlords who were attempting to sell their estates in the Landed Estates Court. The right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer said the landlord had security for one-fifth; but it was not security which an impoverished landlord wanted—it was the use of the money. It was not in the form of a comfortable security he wanted it, even though the Government would pay 3 per cent on it—he did not want the one-fifth locked up in this way. He wished to settle his debts and utilize what there might be over to the best possible advantage, perhaps in some business. If the Government were to issue for that fifth a bond with coupons attached to it, which the landlord could take into market and sell, then he could understand its being a really available security; but if it were to be merely a contract to pay 3 per cent per annum, it was quite useless to the impoverished landlord, and he would be inclined to seek a larger payment in cash. The result would be not to increase the security of the Government, but to diminish it, because it would place an excessive payment upon the tenant and tend to embarrass him. The right hon. Gentleman seemed to think that the Government were exceedingly liberal in this Bill; but if hon. Members came to examine the matter, far from being convinced by what the last speaker had said as to what a banker would ask for an advance, they would find that the Government really were asking something very near what a usurer would ask as a margin upon an advance. They proposed an advance under this Bill really not of £5,000,000, but of £4,000,000. Thus one of the £5,000,000 they said they were going to advance they were going to retain. As a security for the rest they sought one-fifth of the purchase money, which would amount to £1,000,000, and the Church Surplus—three-fourths of £1,000,000—so that for an advance of £4,000,000 they sought a security of £1,750,000, or nearly 50 per cent. Hon. Members would bear him out in saying that any banker or Insurance Company would be content with a very much less margin than that. So far from being remarkable for their liberality in this matter, the Government were asking more than an ordinary banker would ask. If the hon. Member for Sligo would withdraw the Amendment, perhaps the Government would be content with this security, and would not press for more. They would have abundance of security. The Treasury need not give the money if they were not satisfied, and the Land Commission need not give it if they were not satisfied. He (Mr. Gray) would urge on his hon. Friend, after the announcement of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, not to press this particular Motion to a division.

Mr. SINCLAIR said, he wished to say a word or two on what he believed would be the practical working out of this clause. It had been pointed out very clearly by the Attorney General for Ireland that prior to coming before the Land Commissioners there must be an agreement, in the first instance, as to the question of this security, because it must be provided by someone—either by the landlord or by the tenant. If the landlord was to provide the security, he would naturally want a larger price than the tenant would otherwise be willing to pay; on the other hand, if the tenant provided it, he would look for compensation in purchasing at a lower price; therefore its provision would be a matter of arrangement between the landlord and the tenant—between the buyer and the seller. He hoped the Amendment would be withdrawn by the hon. Member. He did not think the Government could go before the country and put this Bill before the taxpayers not only of Ireland, but also of England and Scotland, unless they retained the security of the fifth.

Mr. SEXTON said, he wished to make one or two observations on this matter. He could not accept the arguments of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, although convenience, perhaps, drove him to a conclusion contrary to that which his judgment approved of. With regard to the tenant's interest, according to a Paper read before the Statistical Society, it was shown that even in Clare and Mayo the tenant right was as great—and in some cases greater—than the landlord interest; and that showed that in regard to any advance limited to the landlord's interest a margin of security was left which was not only reasonable, but ample. As to the British taxpayer, all he could say was that if the Government had taken the advice of the Irish Members that individual would have been much more safe, for the Land Purchase Commissioners would have been compelled to take care that the purchase money was fair, and not excessive. He (Mr. Sexton) must say that with the landlord induced by the retention of his money to run up the price of his land, and the Purchase Commissioners induced by having one-fifth on their hands to consent to the running up of the price, they would have burdensome instalments necessary. However, the Chancellor of the Exchequer was responsible for the Bill. The Irish Members had pointed out a much safer way;

but he did not feel that he was in a position to resist very strongly the statement made by the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, whose position reminded him very much of a successful movement made by himself (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) not very long ago against Gentlemen occupying the place he and his Colleagues now filled. If the right hon. Gentleman would assure him that the Government would not insist on the inconvenient overlapping of security which would be involved in the guarantee deposit and the Church Surplus Fund, and would be content with the guarantee deposit superadded to the value of the land, he (Mr. Sexton) would withdraw his Amendment.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I cannot, after the way the hon. Gentleman has met me, delay the Committee by dwelling upon the matter any further. I think I owe it to him and to the Committee to say that, having fully considered this question, I do not think it necessary for us to insist upon the remainder of the Church Surplus as an additional guarantee.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. SEXTON said, he now wished to move his second Amendment—namely, to leave out Sub-section (*b*). With regard to his third Amendment he wished to say——

THE CHAIRMAN: Before the hon. Member brings forward any argument in favour of his third Amendment, I must inform him that I shall not be able to put it. He wishes to substitute £20,000,000 for the sum of £5,000,000; but the Committee has already sanctioned the sum of £5,000,000.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he wished to move an Amendment at the end of Sub-section (*a*) as follows:—

> "Provided no advance shall be made under this Act to any one tenant of more than £3,000."

It appeared to him there ought to be some limit to the amount advanced, and he thought £3,000 would be a fair sum. The object of the Bill was to create peasant proprietors in the ordinary sense of the term, and he did not think it should be extended to large graziers.

Amendment proposed,

In page 2, line 3, at the end of Sub-section (*a*), add—"Provided no advance shall be made under this Act to any one tenant of more than £3,000."—(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I quite agree with the principle of this Amendment. I do not think it is desirable that sales to large graziers should be made under this Act; but, at the same time, I am not prepared to say that the precise limit proposed by the right hon. Gentleman is the right one. I should like to take the opinion of the Treasury on the matter, and then, if necessary, the clause can be amended on Report.

MR. HEALY said, he would suggest that the Land Commissioners should make rules to the effect that they would not give more than a prescribed sum without the assent of the Treasury, Parliament having had in view the granting of only small sums to a certain class of small tenants. That would obviate the necessity of putting any amount in the Bill.

MR. GRAY said, he was under the impression that the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) had an Amendment lower down tending to restrict the operation of the Bill to holdings not altogether pastoral in their character, with the exception of those on which the tenant was resident. He, at any rate, thought that was the tenour of the Amendment the hon. Member contemplated moving lower down. He was not sure that the object of the right hon. Gentleman who proposed the present Amendment would not be more completely met by such an Amendment as that than by providing the restriction of a specific sum. Probably the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy) allowing the Commissioners to make rules in regard to this matter would be even better than this. He wished to point out that in the case of the great grazing farms, as a rule, the tenants were not resident upon them. No doubt, the wording of the clause would require some consideration, so as not to leave out some who might require to avail themselves of the Act. There was no objection to extending the Bill to tenants of pasture lands, even if a higher price than £3,000 were to be paid, provided the tenants were resident.

Question again put.

Colonel KING-HARMAN: I understood these words were to be withdrawn.

Mr. HEALY: No; amended on Report.

Colonel KING-HARMAN: If that is so I will say no more; but I have strong reasons to urge why this Amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: I understand that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer agrees in principle to the Amendment, but that he doubts whether £3,000 is the right sum to fix. I understood him to say he will reconsider the matter between now and the Report.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: Yes; that was what I intended. I understood the principle of the Amendment to be practically what was stated by the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray)—namely, that it is not desirable that tenants of great tracts of grazing land should purchase that land under this Bill; but, of course, a resident tenant of a holding of considerable size would very properly come under the provisions of this Bill as well as the tenant of a small holding. I will promise to look into the matter.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE: I am inclined to go a little farther than the right hon. Gentleman. I do not think that large sums should be advanced to tenants, whether resident or not. It seems to me that the main object of this Bill is to create peasant proprietors, and not to advance money to large holders.

Mr. HEALY said, there would be no harm in letting the thing stand over now in order that the Government could consider it between this and Report.

Question, "That those words be there added," put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. SEXTON said, he now wished to move a sub-section which he had not been able to put upon the Paper, but to which the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) attached great importance. He wished to propose at the end of the words just added to the Bill the following:—

> "No advance shall be made under this Act to a tenant of any land wholly or partly pastoral on which the tenant does not reside."

The policy of this Bill was to make persons residing upon small holdings proprietors of those holdings. He begged to move these words as a sub-section.

Amendment proposed,

> At the end of the last Amendment to add—"No advance shall be made under this Act to a tenant of any land wholly or partly pastoral on which the tenant does not reside."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he wished to point out that if those words were introduced they might injure deserving tenants by preventing them from getting the benefit of the Bill. The Committee would bear in mind that the Land Commission would inquire into each individual case; and he had no doubt that the Commissioners would never allow money to be advanced to a tenant who had a large holding, but did not reside upon it. If this Amendment were passed what would be the consequence? Why, there were a large number of farmers of agricultural land who had adjoining to such land small farms which they used for pastoral purposes. If they made application under the Bill to purchase the agricultural land, it would be very hard if they were deprived of the power of purchasing the pastoral land. If the Amendment were carried it would injure the very class the Bill was promoted to benefit.

Colonel NOLAN said, he thought the objection of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland was a very strong one, and he (Colonel Nolan) himself had put it to his hon. Friend before he had got up. He thought the difficulty, however, could be met if an addition were made to the Amendment as follows:—

> "Unless the holding is under the value of £30, and in the vicinity of the residence of the tenant."

That would meet the whole argument of the right hon. and learned Gentleman, and would give all the benefit that the hon. Member for the City of Cork (Mr. Parnell) wished to bring about. He acknowledged the force of the right hon. and learned Gentleman's objection; and if the Amendment went without some qualification he should see it accepted with much regret.

Mr. SEXTON said, that he thought, on the whole, it would be much more convenient that this matter should be considered when the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman below him (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) was brought up. He would, therefore, withdraw the Amendment, that it might be brought up on Report.

Mr. GRAY said, that with regard to the statement of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland, that the Land Commission would carefully investigate these cases, he wished to express the opinion that the Commissioners would be compelled to make an advance if they were satisfied with the security. There was nothing in the Act to direct the Land Commissioners to investigate what the object of the purchasing tenant was.

Colonel COLTHURST said, it was of great importance to discourage what were known in Ireland as dairy farms—that was to say, cases in which a farmer lived himself upon one farm and put dairymen upon others, charging them an enormous rent and employing no people. The object of the proposed Amendment was of great importance, and he hoped the Government would be able to carry it out.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. SEXTON said, he had an Amendment on the Paper to increase the sum under the Bill from £5,000,000 to £20,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN: This Amendment proposes an excess of the sum authorized by the Committee, and therefore it cannot be put.

Mr. SEXTON said, that when the Money Resolution was put he had desired to raise this discussion then; but he had been told that it would be open for him, if he altered the amount in the Bill, to alter the Resolution afterwards.

The CHAIRMAN: I will not state the words of the Resolution which authorizes a sum of money, not exceeding £5,000,000, to be advanced under the Act. The words are "not exceeding." It is clear, therefore, that the hon. Member would not be in Order in moving his Amendment.

Mr. SEXTON: Will it be open to me to move to leave out the sub-section, without proposing to amend its wording, so that no money at all be granted?

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: I hope the hon. Member will not do that, for if he does, and carries his Amendment, it would be impossible for us to carry out the Bill.

Mr. SEXTON said, that if the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer said it would be impossible to work the Bill if this Amendment were adopted there was no more to be said on the matter. He was sorry that the Government had not seen their way to putting a larger amount in the Bill, because, anxious as he was to see the Bill work properly, he was afraid it was not possible for it to do so with the limited sum which was to be advanced under it.

Mr. HEALY said, that as the Act of 1881 was passed it contained an Instruction to the Land Commissioners to make Rules; and perhaps the Government would consider whether, by Circular or in some other way, they could not express to the Commissioners their view as to the class of persons to whom those advances should be made, and also as to the manner in which those advances should be made. Supposing what happened in the case of the Act of 1881 should happen in respect of this Act? Supposing there should be a rush of applications from one particular quarter of the country? The Sub-Commissioners might give out the whole £5,000,000 to that district, other tenants who would have been glad enough to avail themselves of the privileges of the Bill, but who had been slower to find out the benefits of the Act, being unable to obtain advances. His own opinion was that the Act should not be put in operation for three or four months—that no advance should be made until the people who were to be benefited knew exactly what the benefits of the Bill would be, and that the Land Commissioners, when the applications came in, should be able to make a choice. Those matters were matters which should be regulated by the good sense of the gentlemen who would have to administer the Act. He would ask for an expression of opinion from the Government upon this question. He thought it would be very unfortunate if this Bill were administered in the sense of first come first served.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (Deposit of money as guarantee fund).

Mr. BRODRICK desired an explanation of this clause, by which it was provided—

> "That any person willing to secure the repayment of an advance made by the Land Commission to a tenant who is purchasing his holding either from the Land Commission or from the landlord of such holding may deposit with the Land Commission such sum, as a guarantee deposit, not being less than one-fifth of the advance, as may be agreed on between him and the Land Commission."

He could not understand the value of that provision. He thought that the security demanded by the Land Commission ought to be in all cases one-fifth of the sum. He would move formally to leave out the word "such" in line 10 and insert "a."

Amendment proposed, in page 2, line 10, to leave out the word "such" and insert "a."—(*Mr. Brodrick.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, that the clause had been drawn upon the lines of similar clauses in former Acts. There would be a minimum or certain margin beyond which the Land Commission could not go. Under certain circumstances it could be conceived that one-fifth would not be a sufficient guarantee.

Mr. BRODRICK said, in that case the whole position of the guarantee was entirely altered, because the Land Commission would have power to demand, on behalf of the Treasury, a guarantee of a totally different character from that which hon. Gentlemen were led to suppose. The Committee had gone on the understanding that one-fifth of the whole sum was to be deposited, and if a larger sum was to be demanded it would be almost impossible to come to any terms at all. He believed that this increase of the guarantee would greatly complicate the operation of the Bill. He did not know what the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland meant by the expression "in former Acts." He thought he must take the sense of the Committee upon this question. ["Oh, oh!"] He was quite certain that the effect of the clause was not thoroughly understood by hon. Gentlemen opposite; and, personally, he was inclined to take the sense of the Committee.

Mr. GRAY believed it would be found that these words would have little operation. He thought it was a pity, however, not to provide in this clause for some other form of guarantee. A landlord might be perfectly in a position to give a guarantee, even to the extent of one-fifth of the purchase, in some other form than a deposit of money; for instance, there might be a deposit of securities, or it was conceivable that a bank might be established for the purpose of guaranteeing such advances, at least it was conceivable that the landlord might be able and willing—it might suit him better—to give some other form of guarantee equally good and acceptable to the Government as that contemplated by the clause. By this clause they shut the Government out from taking any other form of guarantee. A man might have India Four per Cents or Consols which he was prepared to deposit; but, owing to the drafting of this clause, the Land Commission would not be able to accept such security. He thought it would be well for the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland to consider whether, if the landlord was ready and willing to give some other guarantee equal in amount and in security to that contemplated by the clause, the Land Commissioners should not be able to accept it. It was quite possible to understand that in many cases it would not be convenient to the landlord to make the deposit in cash.

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Sir William Hart Dyke) said that the clause had been very carefully drafted, and the Government were not disposed to alter it in the way suggested.

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, they were led to believe that in all probability the Land Commissioners would not require more than one-fifth of the advance guaranteed; but experience showed that the Commissioners had acted in a different manner. He would much have preferred his hon. Friend to have proposed to leave out the word "less," and insert "more," so that where the security was good as much as one-fifth need not be required. If his hon. Friend went to a division, however, he should support the Amendment.

Amendment *negatived.*

MR. SEXTON said, the provision in the 4th paragraph was that—

> "The Land Commission shall retain the guarantee deposit until a sum equal to the deposit has been repaid, and shall then pay over the guarantee deposit to the person entitled thereto."

He would like to know what that meant? Let them take the case of a man who bought his farm for £1,000. £200 was deposited. The tenant would pay £40 a-year, and therefore in five years would pay £200, a sum equal to the deposit. Would the landlord be entitled to get his deposit at the end of five years? By the next paragraph it was provided that—

> "If at any time during the period for which the Land Commission are authorized to retain the guarantee deposit any sum due to the Land Commission in respect of an advance secured by a guarantee deposit under this Act is declared by them, by order, to be an irrecoverable debt, the Land Commission may apply the guarantee deposit in discharge or reduction of such irrecoverable debt."

He thought it ought to be clearly defined what the Land Commission must do before they declared the debt to be irrecoverable. Would they proceed in the Civil Bill Court for the instalments, or would they sell the interest to the whole amount? Finally, it was provided that—

> "It shall be lawful for the Land Commission, by order, to declare that the interest in the holding of the person liable to pay such sum shall be charged in favour of the person entitled to the guarantee deposit with the amount of the guarantee deposit."

But if the Land Commission had sold the holding, it appeared to him they would charge the incoming purchaser with the deposit. He thought all these points required some explanation.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said that, as regarded the first point, the intention of the Government was that the deposit money should not be returned until one-fifth of the sum advanced had been paid. To make this quite clear, it would probably be necessary to make an Amendment on Report. As to the second point to which the hon. Member (Mr. Sexton) had called attention, his (the Attorney General for Ireland's) belief was, when this and the other clauses of the Bill were carefully examined, their provisions would be found ample. It would be found that by one of the clauses the duty was imposed on the Land Commission to make use of the power of sale. By a sale they were to seek to realize the amount of the debt due. If the Land Commission declared the deposit forfeited there would be a charge on the holding to the amount of the deposit.

MR. SEXTON understood that if the Land Commission did not resort to a sale of the holding they would make the debt a charge on the holding. Would the Government have any objection to say, in line 33—

> "It shall be lawful for the Land Commission in a case where they do not resort to the power to sell the holding?"

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, if the hon. Gentleman would allow him to consider the matter he might introduce words to make the intention perfectly clear. He thought the words the hon. Gentleman had mentioned, or some such words, were desirable in order to clear up any ambiguity.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 4 (Terms of repayment of advances).

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE) proposed to insert, after the word "Act," in line 5—

> "Or to be made under 'The Landlord and Tenant (Ireland) Act, 1870,' or 'The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881,'"

and also in respect to the advances to be made to tenants under Part II. of "The Tramways and Public Companies (Ireland) Act, 1883." The object of this Amendment was that the advances made in 1870 and 1881, and also those made to public Companies, should be made on the most favourable terms.

Amendment *agreed to.*

On Motion of Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA, the following Amendments made: — Page 3, line 14, after "redeemed," insert "in whole or in part;" line 17, after "it," insert "as is sought to be redeemed."

MR. T. A. DICKSON proposed to add after "tenant," in page 3, line 31—

"(e.) Where any tenant has before the passing of this Act become the purchaser of his holding from the Church Commissioners, under the provisions of 'The Irish Church Act, 1869,' or any Act or Acts amending the same, he shall be entitled to obtain the benefit of this Act upon the terms hereinafter mentioned;

"In case any such tenant shall elect to obtain the benefit of this Act, the Land Commission shall, on the application of such purchaser, ascertain by certificate under their seal the principal sum due by him after all payments, and the sum so due shall be repayable by an annuity of the term and amount mentioned in sub-section (a). This provision shall apply, notwithstanding that such advance or any part thereof may be secured by mortgage;

"(f.) Where any annuities are, at the time of the passing of this Act, payable by tenants who have purchased their holdings under 'The Landlord and Tenant Act, 1870,' or under 'The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881,' in respect to advances made to them for that purpose, the Land Commission shall, on the application of such purchaser, ascertain, by certificate under their seal, the principal sum due after all payments, and the sum so due shall be repayable by an annuity of the term and amount mentioned in sub-section (a.);

"(g.) Where any tenant shall, before the passing of this Act, have entered into a contract for the purchase of his holding, which provides for the payment of his purchase money by instalments, or by an annuity, to secure principal and interest, he shall be at liberty, if he thinks fit, subject to the provisions of the last preceding section, to have the purchase money repayable by an annuity of the term and amount provided by this Act, instead of in the manner provided by such contract, and, if any question of dispute shall arise as to such contract, or annuity, or purchase-money, it shall be decided by the Land Commission."

The hon. Gentleman said, his object in moving this Amendment was to bring within the scope of the Act tenants who purchased their holdings under the Church Act of 1869, and under the Land Act of 1870, and under the Land Act of 1881, that all these purchasers might now have the benefit this Bill conferred of the reduced interest, and of the extension of time. He was very glad to see that since his Amendments had appeared on the Paper the Government had, to some extent, adopted one of them, the one relating to the Church tenants, and that those tenants were to have the advantage of this Bill. But he pointed out that the tenants who purchased under the Land Acts of 1870 and 1881 were in exactly the same position, and it would be unfair to require those tenants to continue to pay the present rate of interest, and to repay the money advanced in the time now specified. He earnestly hoped the Government would take into their consideration the case, not only of the Church tenants who purchased under the Irish Church Act of 1869, but the case of all those tenants who purchased under the subsequent Land Acts. He trusted that the Government would, on this question, take a broad view, and endeavour to place all the purchasing tenants exactly in the same position as regarded interest, and as regarded the period of repayment. It would be a very disastrous thing if the tenants who had already purchased were not placed upon an equality with the tenants who would purchase under this Act, for it would undoubtedly give rise in Ireland to dissatisfaction and heartburning. He trusted that the Government would see their way to extend the consideration they proposed to bestow on the Church tenants to the tenants who purchased under the Land Acts of 1870 and 1881.

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA hoped a concession would not be made in this matter; he did not think the request of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Tyrone (Mr. T. A. Dickson) could be complied with without exhausting some portion of the £5,000,000 voted in order to give effect to the Bill. He hoped the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) would not accept the proposition of his hon. Friend without considering what its effect would be upon the sum voted for the purposes of the Act.

Mr. KENNY said, it was quite clear that the effect of adopting the Amendment of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Tyrone would be that the greater portion of the £5,000,000 which the Government proposed to advance for the purposes of this Act would be consumed in paying the debts of persons who had entered into contracts years ago, and who ought to be bound by the obligations they then entered into. A certain number of men undertook years ago to buy the fee-simple of their holdings, and at the present time the greater portion of the purchase money had been paid off. The tenants who would purchase their holdings under this Bill when it became law had all these years been paying rent which had been absolutely lost to them, and the hon. Gentleman the Member for Tyrone would by his proposal deprive those people as much as he possibly could of the benefits of this Act for the purpose of relieving those who, years ago, with their eyes open, entered into contracts which he (Mr. Kenny) thought it was the duty of Parliament to compel them to carry out.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that the Committee would perhaps allow him to say a few words on this question, because, as hon. Members were aware, the matter was brought before him a few days ago by the hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. T. A. Dickson) and other Members from Ireland. It appeared to him that the glebe tenants stood on a different footing to other purchasers. They purchased at comparatively high rates, because they purchased under circumstances which almost amounted to compulsion. It was necessary that the glebe should be sold, and had they declined to pay the price required they were liable to be outbid by outsiders; therefore it did seem to him, looking at all the circumstances, that the Government might fairly agree to a reduction of the rate of interest, and to an extension of the term of years with regard to the future payments due from the glebe tenants who purchased under the Irish Church Act. But there was great force in the remark made by the hon. Member for Ennis (Mr. Kenny) that the purchasers under the Acts of 1870 and 1881 had made contracts of their own free will. He (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) did not wish to dwell upon the fact that they were few in number. He thought it would be doing more than they ought to do, at any rate in this Bill, if they extended the relief beyond that suggested in the Amendment which had been placed on the Paper by his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland.

Mr. WALKER said, he quite felt the fairness of the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer, so far as his proposal went, although it did not go so far as that of the hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. T. A. Dickson). The Amendment of the latter, however, did not propose to make any large concession to those tenants, but merely to reduce the rate of interest, and increase the time for the repayment of the money proportionately. The question was this. The glebe tenants in the Northern part of Ireland who purchased under the Irish Church Act, no doubt, bought at a high rate, and their interest was to be reduced from 4 per cent to 3⅛; but those who bought a year later under the Landlord and Tenant Act, 1870, also bought at a high rate. They paid 3½ per cent, and he could see no reason why that should not also be reduced to 3⅛, and the period of years for repayment extended. The whole question between them was only one of figuring, and he could see no reason why the 1870 tenants should not also receive some concession. It appeared to him to be most unreasonable that there should be in Ireland two different classes of tenants, one class paying 3⅛ per cent, and the other 3½ per cent. He hoped, therefore, that the Amendment would be agreed to.

Mr. LEA hoped the Government would reconsider this matter simply as a matter of fairness to the tenants. It was very important that a provision should not be carried under which one tenant who purchased at the higher rate had to pay 3½ per cent, while another who purchased at a lower rate had only to pay 3⅛. He could understand that the tenant who felt himself at a disadvantage compared with his neighbour would be induced by that very feeling to enlist in any agitation which tended to place them on an equal footing. If the Act were to work harmoniously it should contain no provision of a deterrent character, and the tenant would certainly not have purchased by now if he was led to believe from the experience of past years that by waiting a little longer he could get better terms. He thought that those who bought in 1870 at the higher rate of interest were entitled to be placed on the same footing as the other tenants.

Mr. SEXTON said, he thought there was a great deal of force in what had been said by the hon. Member for Donegal (Mr. Lea). It was true that these tenants were in one particular district, and, for his part, he was perfectly well satisfied with the arrangement as it was. As he understood it, however, the policy of the measure was one of equal dealing. He could not agree that there would be any considerable need for all of this £5,000,000 if they included these tenants, although there certainly would have been if they had accepted his

Amendment. However, he was disposed to join with the hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. T. A. Dickson), and to ask that those tenants should be allowed the lower rate of interest and the same term of years as those under the Irish Church Act. It could not make any serious inroad into the £5,000,000, and would simply resolve itself into a question of Treasury finance. He thought he saw the material for a compromise in this matter. Of course, he believed that there had been farms bought under the Act of 1881, and that the sales had been effected under threat of distress, and things of that sort. Landlords could still put a price on the turf, and do a great many things to make the tenants pay the higher rate; and, therefore, he could understand that under the Act of 1881 there might have been farms bought at the high rate. He thought, however, that persons who bought in the face of the agitation that was going on almost deserved the bad bargains they had made. They had subjected themselves to any demand the landlord liked to make, and they might, therefore, be left out in this concession. At the same time, there was little difference between the tenants who had bought in 1869 and those who had bought under the Act of 1870; and, therefore, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer would consent to include the tenants who bought under the Acts of those years. The right hon. Gentleman would be doing a graceful and a considerate act if he allowed them this concession.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that when he authorized his right hon. Friend the Chief Secretary for Ireland to place this clause on the Paper he did so on the understanding that it would be accepted by those hon. Gentlemen who came to him the other day to express their views on the subject. He was bound to say that after the speeches of hon. Members, and the Amendment which had been moved, he doubted whether he ought not to suggest to his right hon. Friend to withdraw the clause altogether and avoid dealing with the matter in the Bill. The Amendments which were suggested appeared to him to re-open the whole question of the position of various classes of purchasing tenants in a manner which was most unjustifiable. He felt that he must confine the clause to purchasers under the Irish Church Act.

Mr. T. A. DICKSON said, that in the interview to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred he would remember that he had pressed the claims of those who had purchased under the Act of 1870. Indeed, he had always done so. Notice to quit had never been pressed on the tenants in 1870, and yet those tenants now found themselves in a much worse position than they would have been if they had waited until the present year. He did not propose to touch this £5,000,000. All he asked was that the terms of the Treasury should be reduced from 4 per cent to 3⅛ per cent, which would be the interest under the present Bill. A compromise on this question was absolutely necessary; and seeing that the Bill was going quietly through the House, and as he knew the necessity for the Amendment in regard to the tenants of 1870, he must press his proposal.

Mr. SEXTON felt it was necessary to say that upon a far more important point than this he had withdrawn an Amendment of his upon an intimation from the Chancellor of the Exchequer that it might interfere with the progress of the Bill. Under those circumstances, and after what had fallen from the right hon. Gentleman in regard to this point, he could not support the Amendment of the hon. Member for Tyrone (Mr. Dickson).

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:— Ayes 12; Noes 56: Majority 44.—(Div. List, No. 281.)

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Sales of Land.

Clause 5 (Purchase of estates and holdings).

Mr. WALKER said, he begged to move in page 3, line 40, after "advance," to insert—

> "Where any holdings in a town or village or other holdings not agricultural in their character form part of an estate for the sale of which the Land Commission may have contracted, or for the purchase of which or (in the opinion of the Land Commission) a sufficient part of which the tenants or (in the opinion of the Land Commission) a sufficient number thereof shall have entered into agreements with their landlord, then if the Land Commission (due regard being had to the proportion which such holdings, non-

> agricultural, bear in extent and value to the rest of the estate) should consider it expedient that this provision should apply, the like agreements and purchases, either by the Land Commission or the tenants, may be made in respect of such non-agricultural holdings or any of them, and the like advances under this Act may be made for the purchase of such non-agricultural holdings, or any of them, as if the same were agricultural holdings; and this Act shall be deemed in all respects to apply thereto."

The object of this clause was to meet a case which had often happened before, and which might frequently happen in the future. The clause would, of course, only deal with those holdings which were in the town or village which formed part of the estate which was being sold under the Act. It would be to the advantage both of the tenant and the landlord that this provision should be inserted in the Bill. They would neither of them have any responsibility in the matter at all, for the question whether the purchase should be made or not would rest upon the responsibility of the Land Commissioners.

Mr. GRAY said, he was sorry to interrupt the hon. and learned Gentleman; but he had an Amendment which came in before his—in line 35, after the word "estate," to insert the words—

> "Providing that the Commissioners shall not buy an estate unless they are satisfied that a majority of the tenants, four-fifths in number, have agreed to purchase their holdings."

Now, unless there was a provision securing that at least a certain proportion of tenants should have agreed to purchase before the Land Commission offered to purchase the estate, it might operate very harshly against the tenant. He apologized for bringing on the matter in the middle of the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman; but he would have been ruled out of Order if he had not brought it up now, for he could not see where else in the clause it would come in. What he desired to effect was that the Commissioners should not be able, if they purchased an estate, to sell to outsiders, over the heads of the tenants, who would be enabled under this Bill to borrow one-half of the purchase money. He wished to prevent the land falling into the hands of land speculators, and with the purpose of effecting that object he desired that the Commissioners should be satisfied beforehand that a substantial proportion of the tenants on the estate were willing to buy their holdings. He proposed four-fifths; but of course that was an outside proportion.

Amendment proposed,

> In page 3, line 35, to insert, after "may purchase any estate," the words "on which four-fifths of the tenants have agreed to purchase their holdings."—(*Mr. Gray.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. SEXTON said, he proposed to add words at the end of the first paragraph of Clause 7, which provided that—

> "Where the Land Commission have purchased an estate, they may sell any parcels which they do not sell to the tenants thereof in such manner as they think fit,"

to enact that the parcels disposed of in that manner should not be more than one-tenth of the entire estate. His hon. Friend proposed one-fifth; but he thought that one-tenth would be quite enough. This was a Bill to provide facilities for the sale of land to the occupying tenants; but this was a proposal to give a new lease to the landlords. He could not consent to such a proposal for a moment. If the Land Commission were once induced to buy the estate, there would be no limit to the portion they might sell to speculators who would be tempted by the offer of an advance of a portion of the purchase money. He therefore thought it would be proper to provide that only a certain fraction of the estate should be disposed of in that manner.

Mr. GRAY said, he had no objection, if it were considered more convenient, to withdraw the Amendment until Clause 7 was reached. He thought it was necessary to give some such power to the Land Commission, or one peasant proprietor might prevent the purchase of an entire estate. His only desire was to assist the Land Commission in overcoming a difficulty of that kind, so that they might not find themselves checkmated by a few unreasonable tenants. All he wanted to secure was that if there were a desire to effect the purchase of the estate by the Land Commission, it should come from a substantial portion of the tenants, and that the Commission should not have facilities for purchasing the estate for the mere purpose of re-selling it to land speculators.

Mr. T. A. DICKSON said, the Amendment of the hon. Member provided that four-fifths of the tenants must agree before the Land Commission could purchase. He thought that was too high a portion to require, and would tend to make the Bill entirely inoperative. The proportion ought certainly not to be more than two-thirds, and he would strongly advise the hon. Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray) not to press the Amendment, but to leave the matter to the discretion of the Commissioners. He was satisfied that four-fifths would defeat the object of the Bill.

Mr. GRAY said, he had hoped to obtain some expression of opinion on the part of the Government; but if it were considered more convenient to raise the question on Clause 7 he had no objection to do so. He should certainly have to raise the question again.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Mr. WALKER moved, in page 3, line 40, after "advance," to insert—

"Where any holdings in a town or village or other holdings not agricultural in their character form part of an estate for the sale of which the Land Commission may have contracted, or for the purchase of which or (in the opinion of the Land Commission) a sufficient part of which the tenants or (in the opinion of the Land Commission) a sufficient number thereof shall have entered into agreements with their landlord, then if the Land Commission (due regard being had to the proportion which such holdings, non-agricultural, bear in extent and value to the rest of the estate) should consider it expedient that this provision should apply, the like agreements and purchases, either by the Land Commission or the tenants, may be made in respect of such non-agricultural holdings or any of them, and the like advances under this Act may be made for the purchase of such non-agricultural holdings, or any of them, as if the same were agricultural holdings; and this Act shall be deemed in all respects to apply thereto."

The hon. and learned Gentleman said, the object of the Amendment was to enable the Land Commission to deal with the whole of an estate, and not confine their operations to agricultural holdings.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, the Amendment contained a proposition of a startling character. The Acts of 1870 and 1881 were confined strictly to agricultural holdings; but it was now proposed by his hon. and learned Friend to advance to the tenant of a house having no land in connection with it five-sixths of the purchase money, in order to enable him to purchase the tenement. It appeared to him that the Amendment was an innovation altogether. They had been told again and again that landed property in Ireland stood in a peculiar position so far as the holders of land were concerned; but he was not aware that the holders of houses in Ireland differed from the holders of similar property in the rest of the United Kingdom. He was quite aware that his hon. and learned Friend had stated that the object of the Amendment was to enable the Land Commission to value the whole of an estate and re-sell it where it so happened that property had been purchased by the Commissioners, part of which was situated in a town. But he did not think the Commission would be justified in purchasing house property for any purpose whatever, and he did not think that Parliament ought to give them the power.

Mr. T. A. DICKSON said, he would take the case of the London Companies who were now about to sell their estates in the county of Londonderry. Those estates comprised a number of small villages and a good deal of house property, which was held in conjunction with the land. It would, he thought, be very hard to shut out the village tenants upon the estates of the London Companies from the benefits of this Act; and he was afraid that the Amendment would prejudicially affect a considerable amount of property all over the North of Ireland. He thought that the Amendment of the hon. and learned Member for the County of Londonderry (Mr. Walker) was absolutely necessary. He knew that the London Companies would be placed in a difficult position if they could only sell part of their property, and were obliged to retain all their village property.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA said, the amount of the advance was limited to a sum of £5,000,000, and it would be most unjustifiable to use it in the purchase of villages in the North of Ireland.

Amendment *negatived.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be added to the Bill."

Mr. SEXTON said that, before the clause was passed, he wished the Attorney General to explain what the guaranteed deposits were. Was it intended that one-fifth of the value of the whole estate should remain in the hands of the Land Commission; and, if so, for how long?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, it must be obvious to hon. Members that a very considerable amount of power must be left in the hands of the Land Commission; and it would be necessary to make arrangements with the greater part of the tenants previous to the purchase of an estate for the purpose of selling it to the tenants. Unless there were previous arrangements, and the Land Commission purchased an estate which was defined as a large tract of land, it was necessary that the owner must allow one-fifth of the purchase money to remain as a guaranteed deposit. If some small portion of the estate were not sold by reason of the tenant occupying a portion of it not being disposed to buy, the one-fifth of the guaranteed deposit of the purchase money of land not sold would be returned to the original landlord. The administration of the Act must, however, be left, to a considerable extent, in the hands of the Land Commission; and it was impossible to frame a clause which could meet every contingency that might arise.

Mr. SEXTON said, it was a matter of considerable importance to express, in some way, what the guaranteed deposit was to be. Clause 3 enacted that—

> "Any person willing to secure the repayment of an advance made by the Land Commission to a tenant who is purchasing his holding either from the Land Commission or from the landlord of such holding may deposit with the Land Commission such sum, as a guarantee deposit, not being less than one-fifth of the advance, as may be agreed on between him and the Land Commission."

It was not made manifest anywhere who the person was to be—whether the landlord, the tenant, or any other person.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he had no desire to leave it in doubt as to who the money was to come from. It might come from the landlord, the tenant, or a third person; but he thought the only person it was likely to come from was the landlord. It would certainly not be the tenant who would pay the deposit; and the person who would advance it would, as a rule, be the landlord.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Power to tenant for life to leave part of purchase money outstanding. 45 & 46 Vict. c. 38.)

Mr. SEXTON asked the Attorney General for Ireland to explain what was the object of the clause?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, the clause dealt with advances under the Act of 1881. The Government did not propose, by the provisions of the present measure, to put a stop to advances under the Act of 1881. The Bill made provision that one-fifth of the purchase money should remain outstanding; but the Act of 1881 enabled persons who desired to purchase under that Act to do so, upon securing a mortgage of one-fourth of the purchase money upon the holding. It was proposed by this clause to allow one-fourth of the purchase money still to remain as a security to the landlord.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Sales of residues).

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause stand part of the Bill."

Mr. SEXTON said, that now was the time to fix some limit as to the amount of the estate which might be sold to others than tenants. The previous clauses of the Bill enabled the Land Commission, after they had purchased an estate, to re-sell to the tenants; but this clause provided that where the Land Commission had purchased an estate they might sell any parcels which they did not sell to the tenants in such manner as they thought fit; that they might advance to any purchaser of a parcel under this section, on the security of such parcel, one-half of the principal sum paid as the price; and that, subject to that limitation on the amount of the advance, all the provisions of the Act relative to sales and advances to tenants by the Land Commission should apply to the sale of a parcel in like manner as if the parcel had been a holding and the purchaser had been the tenant at the time of his making his purchase. He conceived that the greatest danger might result from the operation of this clause. So far as it allowed the Land Commission to sell to purchasers other than tenants, it departed from the original purpose of the Bill, and controverted it. It afforded facilities to those who were not tenants to purchase the holdings, and instead of that being within the scope of the Bill the exact contrary was the object of the measure. If the Government would accept the proposal he was about to make, they would bring the clause within the limits of safety. Nothing could be more dangerous than to run the risk of creating a new class of landlords. The whole object of the measure was to get rid of the interest of the landlord in the soil, and to make that of the tenant absolute. He begged to move the addition to the clause of the following Proviso:—

"Provided that the parcels shall not together exceed one-tenth of the estate."

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA expressed a hope that the hon. Member would not divide the Committee upon the Amendment.

The CHAIRMAN said, the Committee could not amend the clause now; but any Amendment must be brought up on the Report. There were no Amendments on the Paper; and, therefore, he had put the Question that the clause stand part of the Bill. The only Amendment on the Paper in regard to Clause 7 was one in the name of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) to leave out the clause altogether.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, it was not desirable that the Land Commission should purchase an estate unless they were perfectly certain that they could re-sell the greater part of it to the tenants. He thought that the suggestion of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton), if adopted, would render the operations of the Land Commission more difficult, and would hamper them in their arrangements. If they turned to the 5th clause, they would find that the only object with which the Land Commission could purchase an estate was for the purpose of re-selling to the tenants of the lands comprised in such estate their respective holdings; and the object of the 7th clause was to provide that if there were three or four holdings which could not be sold to the tenants they might be brought into the open market; but certainly the Government did not want, nor had they ever contemplated, that as much as one-fifth of the estate should be disposed of in that way. Wherever it was possible the whole would be sold to the tenants; and this provision as to a sale to the general public would only apply to an isolated holding which, under some exceptional circumstances, was not taken by the tenants.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Vesting order in lieu of conveyance).

Mr. SEXTON said, that before the Question was put that the clause should stand part of the Bill he had an Amendment to move which was not on the Paper. He proposed to omit the words of the clause from the beginning of line 35 down to the words "it shall be lawful" in line 40. The words he proposed to leave out provided that when a holding had been sold by the Land Commission to a tenant or other person, and also when a holding had been sold by a landlord to a tenant, and it had been agreed between the Commission, the landlord, and the tenant, that the sale should be carried into effect by means of a vesting order of the Land Commission, it should be lawful for the Commission, after a due investigation of title, to make an order vesting the holding in the purchaser. If his Amendment were adopted, the clause would commence with the words "it shall be lawful," &c. The lines struck out dictated the method of conveyance by which the holding should be sold. When the holding was sold by the Land Commission, it would be lawful for them to make a vesting order; but if the sale was by the landlord to the tenant, then the landlord appeared to have power to dictate to the tenant whether he was to use a vesting order or a conveyance. A vesting order would be much cheaper, and he did not see why it should not be used in all cases.

Amendment proposed,

In page 4, lines 35 to 40, to omit the words—"When a holding has been sold by the Land Commission to a tenant or other person, also when a holding has been sold by a landlord to a tenant, and it has been agreed between the Land Commission and the landlord and the tenant that such sale shall be carried into effect by means of a vesting order of the Land Commission under this Act."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he would tell the hon. Gentleman why it was desirable to preserve these words in the clause. If the landlord and tenant made a bargain outside the Land Commission, except so far as they applied to the Commission to advance the money, there must be an agreement between the three parties as to how the purchase was to be carried out. If the Land Commission said that the contract must be carried out in any particular way, they might do something to interfere with the freedom of contract.

Mr. SEXTON said, that a vesting order was much cheaper. Why should there be any provision to enable the landlord to impose upon the tenant a more expensive method of proceeding?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, the basis of the Bill was an agreement between the parties. Nothing was made compulsory on one party or the other in any part of the Bill, and he did not think it desirable that it should be so.

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. SEXTON moved, at the end of the first paragraph of the clause, in page 5, to omit the words which required the vesting order to be made subject to such charges, rights, and easements as might be specified in the order, or, if the vesting order so declared, subject to such charges, rights, and easements as might lawfully affect the holding. He maintained that this Amendment was only carrying out the policy of the Bill, which was to render the purchase as free from encumbrances as possible. Every effort should be made to accomplish that object; and he imagined that there was a provision in the Bill later on to buy up all the encumbrances, so as to make the purchase as free as possible to the tenant. It appeared to him, therefore, that it was undesirable to retain these words.

Amendment proposed,

In page 5, line 2, to leave out the words, "subject to such charges, rights, and easements as may be specified in such order; or, if the vesting order so declares, subject to such charges, rights, and easements as may lawfully affect such holding."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, the omission of these words would have a contrary effect to that which the hon. Member intended. The object of the clause was to convey the land to the purchaser free, and without any encumbrance whatever. At the same time, it might be impossible to define the precise position in which the land was vested in the tenant except by rendering it subject to the charges, rights, and easements specified in the vesting order. If these words were struck out, there might be a law suit in every case in which a holding was sold.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, that if that were the case, might not the assertion of these easements in the instrument of conveyance have the effect of destroying those of persons other than the landlord? They might be getting rid of an evil which now existed for the benefit of some person who was not a party to the conveyance. Would it not be much better to leave out the easements altogether? The clause as it stood might enable a landlord to keep up an easement which might materially interfere with the right of way of the tenant.

Colonel NOLAN said, he did not think the Committee ought to leave out easements altogether. If they did it might be discovered hereafter that one holding had been sold with no right of way, and another with no access to water.

Mr. SEXTON said, that if his hon. and gallant Friend looked a little further down the Bill he would find in one of the sub-sections of Clause 9 the following elaborate provision as to rights of common, rights of way, and other rights and easements:—

"(2.) The Land Commission may, if they think fit, after due and sufficient inquiry, declare by their order that the sale is made subject to any rights of common, rights of way, or other rights or easements which the Land Commission find to affect such holding; and in that case the rights and easements so declared shall be the only rights or easements affecting the holding; or they may abstain from making any such declaration, and in that case the holding shall be deemed to be sold subject to such rights of common, rights of way, and other rights or easements as may lawfully affect the same."

Therefore, the cases referred to by his hon. and gallant Friend the Member for Galway (Colonel Nolan) were provided for in this sub-section. If there were other rights and easements the Bill continued the power to the landlord over the holding in reference to them. Of course, as a layman, he (Mr. Sexton) was prepared to take the word of the right hon. and learned Attorney General that when, in an Act of Parliament, they wanted to make provision for one thing, it was necessary to say something that was exactly contrary to what they meant.

Mr. HEALY wished to put this case. Suppose that, owing to some contingency which might arise, the tenant might find it necessary to let out a portion of the land of which he was actually the tenant, and suppose that the Land Commission made a vesting order, why should the doctrine of merger continue? Was it contemplated by the Bill that that doctrine should have effect? He did not say that it would be so; but he thought that in such a case the doctrine of merger should not apply. If the holding were let to another person, all the rights under the Act of 1881 would be continued. He was afraid that if the clause were retained in its present shape many complications might arise three or four years hence.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he hoped the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) would not press this Amendment. It was necessary, in the opinion of Her Majesty's Government, to make the provision contained in the clause which the hon. Member wished to strike out.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA said, he took exception to the rule which had been laid down in this clause by the right hon. and learned Gentleman. If another landlord or another tenant was in possession of contiguous property to which there was the right of way the tenant who had purchased his holding should not be able to deprive him of that right of way in consequence of any omission to specify it in the conveyance. He did not think there was anything to be gained by retaining the words which the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton) proposed to strike out, and which he regarded at best as so much useless verbiage.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 5, line 14, to leave out from the word "Act" to the end of the paragraph.—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, if there were not in the Bill a clause of this character, some serious questions might be raised which it was necessary to avoid. The object of the words was that the title should be given to the person really entitled to it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Charges and rights subject to which the sale may be made).

Amendment proposed,

In page 5, line 24, after the word "fit," to insert the words "with the assent of the purchaser."—(*Mr. Walker.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he saw no objection to the introduction of the words, although he did not think there was any necessity for it. He was willing to agree to the proposal of his hon. and learned Friend.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. WALKER said, that very useful words were contained in Sub-section (5) of the clause with which the Committee were dealing. Having regard to the provision made in Clause 8, that the vesting order should be made after due investigation of title, it occurred to him that it would be better to provide that all encumbrances should be transferred to the purchase money, and that the tenant should get a complete title. He submitted to the consideration of his right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland the question as to whether the clause which he now begged to move would not be of advantage in the Bill.

Amendment proposed,

In page 6, line 11, after "may," leave out to end of sub-section (5), and insert "notwithstanding anything hereinbefore contained, be made at any time after the application for such vesting order has been made to the court, and same may be made though the landlord is only tenant for life, or has the powers of a tenant for life, and whether or not the holding, either solely or in common with other lands, is subject to any encumbrance or annual charge, and the fact of such encumbrance or annual charge affecting only a partial interest in the estate sold, such as a tenancy for life or lesser interest, shall not affect the right to make such vesting order, but the purchase-money shall in all cases where the court shall think fit be paid into court to abide the further order of the court, and shall, for all purposes as regards the rights or claims of any person to or against the estate sold, represent such estate, and unless and so far as the vesting order shall otherwise declare, the rights and claims of all persons in respect of the estate sold, or any encumbrance or annual charge thereon, shall, from the date of such vesting order, be transferred to the purchase-money, and the purchaser shall be wholly freed from any liability or claim in respect thereof."—(*Mr. Walker.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he was disposed to think that the whole of this clause was to be found in the Bill; but he had examined it carefully, and had no objection to its being added to the clause.

Amendment *agreed to.*

CAPTAIN AYLMER said, he proposed to move the Amendment next on the Paper and standing in his name. He wished to provide that—

"Where any holding forms part of an estate subject to any mortgage, incumbrance, or charge, the Land Commission may assist the owner of such estate to clear off such mortgage, encumbrance, or charge, by advancing to him a sum of money, which shall be repaid by an annuity in favour of the Land Commission, for forty-nine years, of four pounds for every one hundred pounds of such advance;"

and he further proposed—

"That such annuity shall not exceed in amount one-half of the total amount payable each year as rent by the tenants on such estate."

He said that if the landlords were to be served at all by the Bill, it would be necessary to make a provision of this kind with regard to estates that were encumbered. There were plenty of landlords who, if his proposal were adopted, would sell estates under the Act which now they would not sell, because they had no interest in doing so. He knew of an estate of 1,500 acres which was encumbered, and, the rents having been reduced by the Act of 1881, the landlord had now no income, and therefore no object in selling now, because the amount that would be realized would not pay off the mortgages and leave anything for the landlord. The only course the landlord could take was not to sell, but to wait, in the hope that hereafter the estate would fetch a better price than now. Clearly the only way to induce landlords in this position to sell was to enable them to pay off the charges on their land, so that they might have something left for themselves.

THE CHAIRMAN said, he did not think the hon. and gallant Member could proceed with his Amendment, which was not germane to the Bill.

CAPTAIN AYLMER asked if it would be germane to the Bill, where notice was given to landlords, to sell parts of estates to tenants?

THE CHAIRMAN said, it would not be germane to the Bill.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 10 to 12, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 13 (Sales to be for a gross sum. Stamp duty.)

MR. SEXTON said, he rose to move the omission of the words—

"On every sale, when an advance is made by the Land Commission to the purchaser, the Land Commission shall charge the purchaser with one gross sum, which shall include the advance, the stamp duty on the vesting order or conveyance, if any, made by the Land Commission, and the stamp duty and fees payable for registering such vesting order or conveyance."

He pointed out that in this case it was the landlord who received the money and the tenant who paid it. He certainly thought that the person who received the lump sum and on whose account the Bill was devised should be the person to pay the charges described in this paragraph.

Amendment proposed,

In page 7, line 28, to leave out from "on every sale" to "conveyance," in line 33, inclusive.—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, Her Majesty's Government could not assent to the hon. Member's Amendment, which simply provided for the usual charges being made to the purchaser of land.

Amendment *negatived.*

Amendment proposed, in page 7, line 32, to leave out the words "the stamp duty and."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Amendment *negatived.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 7, line 36, to insert the words "every vesting order and conveyance shall state the Ordnance name of the holding, and also the advance and terms of repayment."—(*Colonel King-Harman.*)

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 7, line 36, to insert "A duplicate of such vesting order or conveyance shall be lodged in the Registry of Deeds Office, and shall answer the purposes of and be deemed a sufficient substitute for a Memorial." — (*Colonel King-Harman.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he thought that this would be a rather dangerous alteration. As the Committee would be aware, there was at present a recognized mode of registering an order, and he was not aware that there was any reason for deviating from it. He considered that the operation suggested by the hon. and gallant Gentleman would be more expensive than having the Memorial. The Memorial would be a shorter process. He did not think there would be any saving, and the Amendment of the hon. and gallant Gentleman, if adopted, might lead to a considerable amount of inconvenience.

Colonel KING-HARMAN pointed out that the expense would be less, because any educated man could draw up a duplicate. It was true that a Memorial was shorter than a duplicate, but it took a rather strong head to make it up; and, according to his experience, a barrister had to be employed. He wished to avoid the cost of that in the case of these holdings.

Mr. HEALY asked if the Attorney General for Ireland would give a promise that Rules should be drawn up to make the operation as cheap as possible?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he would bring up a clause on Report to provide that Rules should be drawn up.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 14 *agreed to.*

Clause 15 (Injunction to put purchaser in possession).

Amendment proposed,

In page 8, line 10, after the word "commission," to insert the words "under the powers contained or referred to in the preceding section."—(*Mr. Walker.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he admitted that the greater number of cases to which this clause would be applicable would be cases under the preceding section; but there were others that would not be so, and therefore he was unable to adopt the words of his hon. and learned Friend.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Supplemental Provisions.

Clause 16 (Charge upon the Irish Church Surplus Fund. 44 & 45 Vict.)

Amendment proposed, to leave out the Clause.—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause 17 (Additional members and officers of the Land Commission).

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, he thought the two additional Commissioners to be appointed under the Act ought, in his opinion, to be placed on a level with the existing Commissioners in point of salary, and he therefore begged to move that their salary be £3,000 per annum.

Amendment proposed, in page 9, line 9, to leave out the word "two," and insert the word "three."—(*Colonel King-Harman.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'two' stand part of the Clause."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, there was a reason why the Government had inserted the word "two"—it was because they did not want to take powers to pay more than they intended to pay. It was suggested that the additional Commissioners should not receive £2,000 a-year, while the Commissioners received £3,000 a-year; but it must be borne in mind that the Commissioners had to perform duties of a very important character which the additional Commissioners could not possibly have to discharge—amongst others he might mention appeals. [MR. SEXTON: They get their expenses.] That was true; but he was sure that the hon. Member for Sligo would admit that the amount paid them did not represent the great inconvenience they were put to. Having regard to the less difficult character and less onerous nature of the duties that the additional Commissioners would have to perform, he thought the amount of £2,000 named in the clause was a reasonable one.

MR. SEXTON said, he wanted to know on what ground the new Commissioners were to remain stationary in Dublin? If the Committee looked forward to lines 20, 23, and 29, they would see how the work of the Commissioners might be distributed. He did not know whether the £2,000 named in the clause was sufficient; but he said that one man was as clearly worth the salary of £3,000 as the others.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, the question was, what salary was required to secure competent Commissioners. As a matter of fact, they had named gentlemen who had been unanimously accepted as competent to do the work; and those gentlemen had been named with a full knowledge on their part that the salary stated in the Bill would be paid. He must, therefore, ask the Committee to agree to the amount named in the clause.

MR. SEXTON asked if the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer would be willing to lower the salaries of the existing Commissioners?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I should very much like to do so from the Treasury point of view; but it is one thing to lower the salaries of existing officers, and another thing to fix new ones.

MR. HEALY said, the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland had stated that the powers of the Assistant Commissioners would never be co-ordinate with those of the Chief Commissioners. That he (Mr. Healy) thought objectionable. He thought the Committee should have an opportunity of knowing the meaning of this clause. In the first place, it said that Her Majesty might, by Warrant under Sign Manual, appoint some fit person to fill any vacancy that might occur within the period of seven years. And then the clause went on to say that—

> "The Lord Lieutenant may from time to time by order direct that the additional members of the Land Commission appointed under this Act, or such member or members of the Land Commission as he thinks fit, shall specially attend to the business imposed upon the Land Commission by this Act."

Now, he would like to ask why should not the powers of the new Commissioners be co-ordinate with those of the existing Commissioners? He thought it right that those gentlemen should specially attend to the work under this Act; but it must be remembered that there was a great block in the Land Court at present, and their services would be very useful there. Some means ought to be taken to relieve the congestion which existed in that Court. With regard to the amount of salary, he thought it should not be limited to £2,000. He suggested that the words should be "not more than three thousand pounds," but that the amount should be £2,000 for the present, and then, if it was necessary hereafter to pay more, there would be no occasion to bring in another Bill for the purpose. He asked the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer not to tie the hands of the Commissioners in the way proposed in the clause. The right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland had spoken of the appeals in the Land Court as a matter which required serious consideration. There were 9,000 appeals in the Appeal Court. Last year the Government proposed to appoint additional Commissioners; it was now proposed to appoint two new ones. If they had spare time to attend to other work, why should they not have fair salaries? It might be found that this Bill would not work at all, and as the Commissioners would be appointed for three years those gentlemen might just as well be availed of for getting rid of the block in the Appeal Court. And yet the Government seemed to have made up their minds to prevent that by reason of the question of salary. If the theory was that the Commissioners got £3,000 for going round the country hearing appeals, those new Commissioners, if they heard appeals, should also get £3,000. Even though they had undertaken their work for £2,000 a-year, the Bill should not tie the Treasury up in a hard-and-fast way to a certain amount, so that it would subsequently be necessary to bring in an Act of Parliament to give them extra remuneration if they did appeal work. He hoped the Government, while retaining this £2,000 in the Bill for the present, would say that they would make some change later on, so that it would not be necessary eventually to have to come to Parliament for a new Act.

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, his impression was that, if this Bill was to be worked successfully, these two Commissioners should go about the country. It was much more important that they should travel from place to place visiting the tenants than that they should simply confine themselves to visiting large towns, indulging in the comforts of the best hotels. He did not want the Government to fix the salaries.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. SEXTON sincerely hoped the Government would seriously consider this question of the interchange of duties. It must be evident to everybody that the Commissioner who fixed fair rents ought not to be the person to consider the purchases under those rents. He thought the men who were carrying out the purchases should not be the men who fixed the fair rents. There were two elements in this business—fair rents and purchase money—and each should be under the management of a different authority. He begged to move the omission of the following words from the clause:—

> "The Lord Lieutenant may from time to time by order direct that the additional members of the Land Commission appointed under this Act, or such member or members of the Land Commission as he thinks fit, shall specially attend to the business imposed upon the Land Commission by this Act.
>
> "Any person so nominated for the time being may act in the name of the Land Commission in carrying this Act into effect; and anything done by him shall be as valid and effectual as if it were done by the Land Commission.
>
> "Notwithstanding the appointment of additional Land Commissioners under this Act, any matter or thing which under the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881, was required to be done by three members of the Land Commission sitting together, may be done by any three members sitting together; and any matter or thing which might lawfully be done under the said Act by three members or any less number, may still be done by any three members or any less number, of the Land Commission."

Amendment proposed, in page 9, leave out from beginning of line 23 to end of line 39.—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he could explain in a very few words the object of this part of the clause. The intention of the Government was that the two Commissioners whose names he had read out that night should be Commissioners who should act generally under this Act. Their primary duty would be under this Act; but, at the same time, the Government were not prepared to accept the Amendment standing in the name of his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Walker), because they considered it would be too hard-and-fast an Amendment. It might at times be necessary to make use of those Commissioners as ordinary Land Commissioners temporarily. One of the ordinary Commissioners might, through illness or for some other reason, be unable to attend to his duties, and it might be desirable that one of the new Commissioners should take his place. As he said, the arrangement would only be a temporary one. On the other hand, it might be desirable, in the temporary absence of one of the new Commissioners, that one of the existing Commissioners should undertake his duties. At the same time, of course, the lines it was intended to go on were those which the section laid down under which the duties imposed upon the new Commissioners would be mainly those of this Act. He did not wish to draw that line hard-and-fast, but considered it desirable to give the Lord Lieutenant power from time to time, as circumstances might arise, temporarily to impose upon one or other branch part of the duties of the other.

MR. SEXTON said, he saw no necessity for any provision for aiding the two new Commissioners in the work of purchase. The right hon. and learned Gentleman talked of illness; but gentlemen in receipt of £2,000 a-year had no right to get ill. If, when one of them did get ill, the other Commissioners could carry out his duties, manifestly the existing Commissioners were adequate to discharge the duty of purchase. He would ask the Government whether they could not, before Report, draw up an Amendment to limit this interchange of duty to work other than that of purchase?

MR. HEALY said, that, as one of the Land Commissioners, Mr. Litton, had declared himself so strongly against the purchase scheme, and had protested so loudly that it would lead to separation, he viewed with alarm any proposal to allow the Land Commissioners to interfere with the working of this Bill. The Committee could well imagine that the new Commissioners might not have sufficient work to occupy the whole of their time, and that they might give assistance in getting rid of the block of appeals; but it was not to be expected, looking at this block, that the existing Land Commissioners would be able to take up the work of either of those new officials. The new men might be able to undertake the work of the old men, but he could not think the old men could undertake the work of the new men.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, there was a great deal in what the hon. and learned Member said, and he would promise to consider the proposal before Report.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Member withdraw his Amendment?

MR. SEXTON: Yes.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. WALKER begged to move, in page 9, to leave out from line 23 to line 31, inclusive, and insert—

> "The additional members of the Land Commission appointed under this Act shall specially attend to any business, not being business of a judicial character imposed upon the Land Commission by this Act, and anything so done by them shall be as valid and effectual as if it were done by the Land Commission,
>
> "The Land Commission shall, from time to time, make rules for the purpose of assigning to such additional Commissioners the business to be so done by them.
>
> "The Judicial Commissioner and Mr. Commissioner Litton, or one of them, shall sit with the said additional Commissioner for the purpose of transacting any business under this Act, which shall not be specially assigned to the additional Commissioner.
>
> "Notwithstanding anything hereinbefore contained, any person interested may apply that any matter arising under this Act may be heard and determined by the Judicial Commissioner and Mr. Commissioner Litton or one of them sitting with the additional Commissioners, and thereupon such matter shall be so heard and determined upon such terms, if any, as the Court shall direct."

He should like the Government to consider this Amendment before Report, because the questions the Amendment referred to would certainly be as important as the hearing of appeals. Whether it would be desirable that the Judicial Commissioner should sit with the additional Commissioner for the purpose of transacting business under the Act would be a matter for the Government to decide.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he did propose to consider this matter before Report, and the reason why he did so was that he thought it should be in the power of the Legal Commissioner, if any question of law were raised, to take part in the investigation.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 18 to 22, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 23 (Saving for the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881, 44 & 45 Vict. c. 49).

MR. SEXTON drew attention to the wording of this clause. It was as follows:—

> "Nothing contained in this Act shall restrict the powers of the Land Commission under the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881. Nothing contained in this Act relative to the making of vesting orders by the Land Commission shall prevent the Land Commission from conveying or assigning any land or holding in the same manner as they might have done if this Act had not been passed."

He desired to know the meaning of the

words, "if this Act had not been passed." Why should not land be transferred by a vesting order, and why should power be reserved for doing it by way of conveyance?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, the words referred to by the hon. Member were introduced into the clause because it was supposed that, under certain circumstances, it would be desirable to resort to the Common Law rather than to vesting order. However, he would consider before Report whether those words could not be omitted.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 24 *agreed to.*

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE) said, that in accordance with a promise made earlier on he now begged to move the following new clause after Clause 22:—

"Whereas certain lessees and tenants of the Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland, referred to in the first paragraph of the fifth sub-section of the thirty-fourth section of 'The Irish Church Act, 1869,' purchased parcels of land from the Commissioners under that Act, and a part of the purchase money was, in some cases, allowed by the Commissioners to remain outstanding, with interest at the rate of four per centum, and was secured to the Commissioners in some cases by a simple mortgage of the property sold, and in other cases by a deed, referred to in this section as an 'instalment mortgage,' providing for the payment of the principal sum, with interest, by an annuity extending over a term of years:

"And whereas, under 'The Irish Church Act Amendment Act, 1881,' the Land Commission are the successors of and stand in the place of the Commissioners of Church Temporalities in Ireland, so far as regards such purchases and deeds of mortgage:

"And it is expedient that the following provisions should take effect; therefore—

"(1.) The rate of interest made payable by every such simple mortgage as aforesaid shall, from and after a day to be determined by the Land Commission by order, be reduced to a rate of three and one-eighth per centum.

"(2.) Any person liable to pay to the Land Commission the annuity secured by such an instalment mortgage as aforesaid may make application to the Land Commission to accept payment of the amount then remaining due on the security of such instalment mortgage upon the terms hereinafter specified:—

(a.) On such application the Land Commission shall ascertain, and by order declare, the amount of the principal money which then remains owing to them on the security of such instalment mortgage; and, by the same order, the Land Commission shall declare how many years would then remain unexpired of a term of forty-nine years, calculated to commence on the day on which the term of years commenced during which the instalments secured by such instalment mortgage were to continue payable;

(b.) The Land Commission shall accept payment of the said sum, with interest at the rate of three and one-eighth per cent, by half-yearly instalments of such amount as shall be ascertained and declared by the Land Commission in such order to be required to pay off the said sum with interest at the rate aforesaid, if paid for the residue then unexpired of the said term of forty-nine years;

(c.) The payment of such instalments shall be secured to the Land Commission by deed, in such form as they may determine, which shall be in substitution for the instalment mortgage, and which shall be exempt from stamp duty;

"(3.) No order shall be made with reference to any debt secured by a simple mortgage unless all interest on that debt due before the making of the order is then paid up;

No order shall be made with reference to any debt secured by an instalment mortgage, unless all instalments due before the making of the order are then paid up;

"(4.) Nothing contained in this section shall apply to any debt due to the Land Commission in respect of any purchase from the Commissioners of Church Temporalities of land held from or under them by virtue of any lease for twenty-one years, or for three lives or twenty-one years, or for forty years, or for three lives, referred to in the last paragraph of the said fifth sub-section of the thirty-fourth section of "The Irish Church Act, 1869."

New Clause (Terms of repayment of advances to tenant purchasers under the Irish Church Act,)—(*Sir William Hart Dyke,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Clause read a second time, and *added* to the Bill.

MR. SEXTON said, the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for County Dublin (Colonel King-Harman) had placed the following clause on the Paper:—

"In addition to the powers by Part V. of "The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881," conferred on the Irish Land Commission in reference to the acquisition of land by tenants, the following additional powers are hereby conferred on the said Land Commission:—

(a.) Where the landlord of a holding has agreed with the tenant thereof who has obtained or shall hereafter obtain a statutory term of such holding under the provisions of 'The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881,' to make such fee-farm grant as hereinafter mentioned, and where the Land Commission having investigated are satisfied of the title of the landlord to make such grant, the Land Commission shall be at liberty to advance to the landlord, or pay or apply the same in discharge of incumbrances affecting the landlord's estate in the holding or in accordance with the trusts (if any) binding such estate, a sum sufficient to purchase up one moiety of the judicial rent of the holding on the landlord and tenant executing under the direction of the Land Commission a fee-farm grant of the holding at a fee-farm rent equal in amount to the remaining moiety of the said judicial rent, such advance to be secured by an annuity in favour of the Land Commission for forty nine years at four pounds per centum out of the estate in fee farm-under the said grant;

(b.) Should the tenant of any such holding neglect or refuse for a period of six months after notice in writing given to him by the landlord of his willingness to execute such a grant as in the last sub-section mentioned, it shall be lawful for the Land Commission to advance to the landlord, or pay or apply the same in the discharge of incumbrances affecting the landlord's estate in the holding or in accordance with the trusts (if any) binding such estate, such sum as would have been sufficient to purchase one moiety of such judicial rent, on the same being secured by a like annuity for forty-nine years of four pounds per centum out of the estate and interest of the landlord in the holding, and upon the terms that the landlord, on the request of the tenant, shall at any time within the said statutory term execute to the tenant a fee-farm grant at a rent equal in amount to the remaining moiety of the said judicial rent, and in such latter case and on the execution of such fee-farm grant by the landlord and tenant, the annuity payable by the landlord shall cease, and shall be transferred to the estate of the tenant under such fee-farm grant, and the period for which the annuity shall continue shall be for the residue of the term of forty-nine years from the period when such annuity was made payable by the landlord."

He desired to know whether that clause could be moved? This was a Bill to provide greater facilities for the sale of land to occupying tenants in Ireland, whereas this clause proposed the extension of 44 & 45 *Vict.* c. 5, to the conversion of statutory tenancies into fee-farm interests. In reality, the clause would convert one form of tenancy into another, and was not consistent with the object of the Bill, which was to enable a sale to take place from one person to another. He submitted that the clause was outside the scope of the Bill, and, therefore, could not be put.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the point raised by the hon. Gentleman is very just, and that this clause cannot be considered as within the scope of the Bill.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN moved the following new Clause:—

"When the purchase money of one moiety of the judicial rent has been paid to the landlord or applied in the manner hereinbefore provided, either on purchase by the tenant, or advanced by the Land Commission in case of refusal by the tenant, the unexpired portion of any present statutory term shall be counted as part of the forty-nine years accessory to clear off interest and principal. At the close of the first statutory term it shall be lawful for the Land Commission to agree with the tenant either that the same rent shall continue for the remainder of the forty-nine years, or that a new period of forty-nine years shall then commence at a proportionately reduced rate of annual payment."

New Clause (Power to extend time for payment),—(*Colonel King-Harman,*) *brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read the second time."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) could not accept the clause for the reason that the estimates under the Settled Land Act were not at all suited to the proposed provision.

Question put, and *negatived.*

COLONEL KING-HARMAN moved the following new Clause:—

"Notwithstanding the provisions of the Landed Estates Court Act, section sixty-four, it shall be lawful for the Land Commission to invest in any of the securities sanctioned by 'The Settled Land Act, 1882,' the moneys by said section sixty-four directed to be laid out in purchase of land, or directed by same section to be paid to trustees."

New Clause (Powers of investment of purchase money in cases of sales—21 & 22 Vic. c. 72, s. 64),—(*Colonel King-Harman,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read the second time."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, this clause seemed to be a very reasonable one; but he would suggest that, instead of confining it to the 79th and 82nd sections of the Landed Estates Court Act, it should apply also to the 80th and 81st sections.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN: I beg to amend it accordingly.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed,

In line 6, after "seventy-ninth," to insert "eightieth and eighty-first."—(*Colonel King-Harman.*)

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT proposed the following new Clause:—

"Where the landlord and tenant of any holding agree to substitute a tenure in perpetuity or fee-farm grant, accompanied by a fining down of rent, as in section twenty-four (b) of 'The Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881,' for a complete sale and purchase under the provisions of this Act, then the whole of such fine to be paid to the landlord shall be advanced to the tenant upon the same terms as to repayment as are provided by Clause four of this Act."

MR. SEXTON: I think, Sir, this clause comes under the Rule of Order you decided just now.

THE CHAIRMAN said, the clause could not be put.

MR. WALKER moved the following new Clause:—

"The Land Commission shall have power at any time to apportion any incumbrance or annual charge affecting the estate or holding sold or the purchase-money thereof, and to commute to any capital sum or value, to any amount they may under all the circumstances think reasonable, any incumbrance or annual charge or any apportioned part thereof affecting the estate or holding sold or the purchase-money thereof, and may make any payment based upon such apportionment, commutation, or valuation."

He wished this clause to be inserted after Clause 10. The object of it was to enable the Land Commission to commute any incumbrance or annual charge on an estate.

New Clause (Apportionment and commutation of annual charge),—(*Mr. Walker,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read the second time."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, it would be impossible to accept this clause. Such a thing would be entirely new matter in law. As a rule, incumbrances had been brought about by the lending of money on an entire estate, and it would be difficult, if not unfair, in certain cases, to split it up into several sums. The Government had considered that fact very carefully. There was already a provision in the Bill, taken from the Landed Estates Court Act, allowing a certain portion to be commuted for a certain sum, and he did not think they could go further than that.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. WALKER said, he begged to move, as a new clause, the following:—

"The word 'tenant' shall include a tenant holding under a fee-farm grant."

New Clause (Definition), — (*Mr. Walker,*)—*brought up,* and read the first time.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES): I think that is fair and reasonable; only I would suggest that the second reading should not be moved, and instead of being brought up as a new clause, it should be incorporated in the Definition Clause on Report.

Clause, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. T. A. DICKSON begged to move the insertion of the following Clause:—

"A tenant shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be in occupation of his holding, notwithstanding that he may have sub-let any part or parts thereof, provided the Land Commission shall deem such sub-letting to be reasonable, having regard to the proportion which the portion of the holding so sub-let bears to the entire of the holding, and also to the other circumstances of the case.

"Clerks and officers in the employment of the Land Commission shall be entitled to such compensation or superannuation allowance as is provided in the case of persons serving in the permanent civil service of the State; and in estimating such superannuation allowance, the time (if any) spent by such officers, clerks, or other persons in the employment of the Church Temporalities Commission shall be taken into account."

There were many cases where sub-letting was necessary; and he maintained that if this clause were not accepted, a number of purchases which would otherwise be effected would fall through. The clause would give power to the Land Commissioners to adjudicate as to whether sub-letting was fair and reasonable or not. He hoped the Government would accept the proposal, and assured them that if they did not, it would have an unfortunate effect upon the working of the Act.

New Clause (Sub-letting not to disqualify tenant purchasing),—(*Mr. T. A. Dickson,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member cannot move the second portion of his clause; it would necessitate a grant of public money.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read the second time."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he could not accept the clause, as it seemed to him contrary not only to the policy of this Act, but to the policy of other Acts. The object was to give a tenant in occupation the power of working his land.

MR. SEXTON: How much of this is to be taken as one clause? There are two paragraphs, but there is only one title.

Question put, and *negatived.*

COLONEL NOLAN begged to move the insertion of the following Clause:—

> "Any owner may enter into an agreement with one or more of his tenants to let to him or them a portion or the whole of any grass or mountain farm conditionally on the Land Commissioners approving of the sale of such land to such tenant or tenants; and, should the Commissioners approve of this agreement, the tenant or tenants will be considered the occupying tenants of such land for the purposes of this Act.
>
> "The Commissioners may make rules to enable tenants to be treated as the occupying tenants of a grass or mountain farm which the landlord may wish to sell to them."

The object of this clause was to enable the landlord when he was selling to, say, 20 tenants, to say that he would let to them a portion or the whole of any grass or mountain farm, on the Land Commissioners approving, in addition to their holdings, and let them come under the Act. At the present moment a great number of people in Mayo and Galway were thinking more about this than anything else, and in those districts there would be much more agitation on this subject than with regard to the occupation of holdings. At present, most of these tenants had five or six acres; but if they were to be able to get the benefit of this Bill, they would increase them to 10 or 12. It might be said that a landlord could exercise those powers without such a clause as this—that he could divide a grass farm amongst his tenants and bring them under the Bill. But that would be so difficult that the landlord would not do it, because the result would be that he would have given them a grass farm at a high rent, and they would not give it back again to him. What he wanted to do was this—to enable the landlord to say, "I will let you a grass farm on condition the purchase is completed." He believed that would be a great advantage in the West of Ireland, and would cause a great many sales which otherwise would not take place. He hoped the Government would see their way to adopt it.

New Clause (Purchase of grass farms),—(*Colonel Nolan,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read the second time."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he was not quite sure whether he fully understood the clause that had been put upon the Table. It seemed to him there ought to be no anxiety about the matter. If the landlord chose to sell a grass farm to a tenant from year to year, he could do so, and, therefore, as he understood it, the clause was wholly unnecessary. If it meant anything more than he understood, he could not accept it.

COLONEL NOLAN said, the right hon. and learned Gentleman would be making a great mistake if he did not accept it. [*Laughter.*] Hon. Members might laugh; but he could assure them that if he attended any public meetings in Ireland, this was the subject he should ring most loudly. There could be no doubt that the right hon. and learned Gentleman thoroughly understood the question. The people saw these grass farms, and they wished to have them. They were willing to pay the value, and why the Government should draw their Bill so as to shut them out he could not understand. The clause was merely a form to enable the landlords to hand over the grass farms, and there was no interference with property in it. It might be said that these grass farms did not exist; but that was not the case—there were a great many all about Galway and Mayo. Under his proposal, at the time a sale was effected, a landlord would be able to increase his tenant's holding very considerably. If the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland objected to the wording of the clause, he had not the slightest objection to let him draft it himself.

Mr. GRAY said, the object of the Amendment was very properly to enable the landlord to increase the tenant's holding at the time of sale, and the landlord would be enabled to take back the land in the event of the sale falling through. In the Tramways Act there was a provision for the taking of land and its re-sale to the tenant—something very like the present proposal. Some tenants might have holdings so small and so poor that the sale to them would really be of no benefit, and the landlord might have land upon his hands which he would be willing to divide amongst his tenants for the purpose of sale, but which he was not able to give them if they were to remain his tenants. There was no means of providing in the Bill as it stood that the landlord should make the additional contract with an existing tenant to increase his holding if a sale was effected. There was no doubt that this new clause would be exceedingly desirable in the West of Ireland. Of course, if it were considered desirable, the phraseology might be improved. He thought that where a landlord was willing to sell, and a tenant was willing to buy, there was no reason why there should not be an enlargement of the tenant's holding. It would be well for the Government to consider this matter, with a view to relieve congestion in certain parts of the country, and to enable tenants to get holdings of sufficient size to keep them comfortably.

Mr. SEXTON said, that unless something was done to meet this case, the Act, instead of being a benefit to the poor people of the West, would leave them worse off than they were before. He hoped that on Report the Government would introduce words tending in the direction desired.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA desired to express his approval of the clause proposed by the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Nolan). Many landlords wishing to make the best of their grass land, would be very willing to parcel it out to their tenants. He (Sir Joseph M'Kenna) hoped the Attorney General for Ireland would see his way to accept the principle of this clause, and bring up on Report a clause of his own. If he did that, the right hon. and learned Gentleman would confer a great benefit upon the smaller tenantry of the West of Ireland.

Mr. HEALY said, some provision of this character was required; and, therefore, he trusted the Attorney General for Ireland would confer with the hon. and gallant Gentleman (Colonel Nolan) on the subject.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) was afraid he would only be misleading the Committee if he said he would consider this subject by Report. He did not see how they could adopt the clause of the hon. and gallant Gentleman without altering entirely the scope and character of the Bill.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Schedule.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this be the Schedule of the Bill."

Mr. SINCLAIR thought it would be well to have a second Schedule, showing separately the amount of principal and interest payable in each consecutive year. It would be of advantage, inasmuch as it would serve to do away with the misconception which did exist in Ireland that payments of this kind were payments of rent, instead of principal and interest.

Mr. SEXTON thought the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman a very good one.

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir W. Hart Dyke) thought there would be some difficulty in drafting another Schedule now. There was every possible desire on the part of the Government to give information; but the difficulty of acceding to the suggestion of the hon. Gentleman would be easily understood.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *reported,* with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

MOVEABLE DWELLINGS BILL.

(*Mr. Digby, Mr. Elton, Mr. Burt, Mr. Warton, Mr. Broadhurst.*)

[BILL 239.] SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

MR. DIGBY said, this was a Bill to provide for the registration and regulation of travelling vans and other vehicles used as abodes. The House had, in the Housing of the Working Classes Bill, acknowledged the principle that travelling vans used as houses by gipsies and others should be subjected to certain sanitary regulations. This Bill went further; it dealt with educational matters, and it contained provisions to prevent infection being carried by these moveable dwellings from one part of the country to another. The measure was framed on the lines of the Canal Boats Act, the provisions of which he thought might very fairly be made applicable to travelling vans. He begged to propose that the Bill be now read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Digby.*)

MR. HEALY said, he opposed the Bill on the first reading; and as far as he could see his objections had not been removed by anything which occurred between then and now. Unfortunately, the block of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Cavan (Mr. Biggar) had lapsed; but as it would be quite easy to block the next stage, he (Mr. Healy) need not go into the merits of the Bill. It was well to point out, however, that while this legislation would harass gipsies, the Bill did not propose any penalties for non-registration. Seeing that in future gipsies would probably have votes and be able to return Representatives to Parliament, he thought the hon. Gentleman would do well not to press the Bill.

MR. KENNY said, he was sorry to disagree with his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Healy). The Bill was calculated to do very good service, being aimed, not so much at genuine gipsies, as at people who pretended to be gipsies —people whowere a great annoyance to those amongst whom they lived, and people who lived, to a great extent, by spoil. He happened to sit on the Select Committee on the Canal Boats Act; and judging by what he heard in the Committee, and what he had heard since as to the habits of gipsies, he thought a measure of this kind, which would authorize the Local Government Board to provide for the better inspection of moveable dwellings, and for the education of the children who were brought up in those dwellings, was calculated to do the greatest possible service to the people themselves. Furthermore, he believed the operation of a Bill of this sort would be greatly welcomed by the people of the districts infested by persons masquerading as gipsies.

MR. ELTON said, the sanction which the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy) missed was to be found in the Canal Boats Act, which was intended to be incorporated in the Bill. He thought the House might allow the principle of the Bill to be affirmed.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

MR. HEALY gave Notice that, on going into Committee, he should move that every dwelling so registered should entitle the person occupying it to a vote.

House adjourned at half after
Three o'clock.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Tuesday, 11th August, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading—Third Reading*—County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (Pensions) * (244).

Third Reading—Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2) (245), and *passed.*

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (IRELAND) PROVISIONAL ORDERS BILL.—(No. 246.)

(*The Marquess of Waterford.*)

CONSIDERATION OF COMMONS' REASONS.

Commons' Reasons for disagreeing to one of the Amendments made by the Lords *considered* (according to Order).

THE MARQUESS OF WATERFORD, in explanation, said, that the Commons disagreed to the insertion of the following Clause:—

"For the purpose of the eighth section of the Dublin Corporation Waterworks and Fire Brigade Provisional Order, 1874, the statutable or contract allowance of water to the townships mentioned in that section shall be deemed to be twenty-five gallons per head per day instead of twenty gallons per head per day as provided by the Acts in that section mentioned, relating to those townships respectively."

The Commons' Reasons for disagreeing were—

"1. Because the Amendment alters the quantity of water to be supplied to the townships by existing contracts and Acts of Parliament, without making any provision for an increased payment by the townships.

"2. Because the Amendment is not germane to these Provisional Orders, which only supply a legal basis for ascertaining the population of the townships."

He would now move that their Lordships do not insist on the Amendment they had made in the Bill; and, in doing so, he must decidedly say that the Amendment of the House of Lords had been sprung on their Lordships' House at the last moment by the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Fitzgerald) in a manner which was hardly fair. The matter had been before them on several occasions, and it was of a very simple character, and the Reasons of the Commons for disagreeing to what had been done at the instance of the noble and learned Lord put the whole thing in a most clear and definite light. This Provisional Order Bill was merely for the purpose of assessing the population of the townships near Dublin, and the Committee of their Lordships' House—though in the Committee Room itself they had arrived at a different conclusion—were anxious to put into the measure a clause allowing the townships five gallons of water per head per day more than they received at present, and than they had any right under their Local Acts to ask for. It might be right that the townships should have 25, 30, or 35 gallons of water—that question he (the Marquess of Waterford) would not go into; but the question was whether they were right in trying to force from the Corporation of Dublin five gallons more per head per day for the present payment—in short, that they should have 25 gallons for the same price they had agreed to pay for 20. He contended that if the townships wished to increase their water supply, they should have come to their Lordships' House with a Bill for the purpose. They did not do that; but in a Bill promoted for a totally different purpose—for the purpose of assessing the population—and in a Bill which the Corporation had a perfect right to promote, a clause was brought forward in the House of Lords which had never been mooted in the Commons, seeking to benefit the townships by giving them this additional five gallons of water per head. He hoped their Lordships would not insist upon the Amendment, which was only carried by a majority of 2 on Friday last.

Moved, "That the House do not insist upon their Amendment to which the Commons have disagreed."—(*The Marquess of Waterford.*)

LORD ELPHINSTONE said, he wished to point out to their Lordships that the subject had been before them three times. It would be remembered that when he (Lord Elphinstone) first moved the clause which was the subject of discussion, he had been defeated by a majority of 1. On the following night the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Fitzgerald) brought forward the Amendment again, and carried it by a majority of 2. It then went down to the House of Commons, where it was rejected, and the Bill was sent back from that House with the Reasons of the Commons in disagreeing to the clause. It was suggested that, because it had been rejected by the House of Commons, therefore their Lordships should be content to see it struck out of the Bill. He (Lord Elphinstone) could not accept that doctrine, for the logical conclusion of it would be that their Lordships would have to accept every Private Bill that came from the Lower House without alteration. Now, in this case, the expense of referring the Bill to a Select Committee of the House of Lords had been incurred. Five of their Lordships had sat to consider the Bill, and with the greatest patience they had listened to all the arguments for the Corporation and the townships. Both sides had been brought before them, and they had carefully weighed all the arguments. The noble Marquess (the Marquess of Waterford), on the other hand, had only heard one side of the case—namely, that of the Corporation of Dublin. Whilst he (Lord Elphinstone) had listened to the speech of the noble Marquess, if he had shut his eyes, he could have imagined himself back in the Committee Room listening to the counsel for the Corporation. Could the noble Marquess know as much about the matter as the Members of the Committee, who had devoted 16 hours to its investigation? It was not possible. The Committee had recommended — they even now unanimously recommended—their Lordships to accept the Amendment. If it were rejected, they would simply be handing over the small townships, bound hand-and-foot, to the tender mercies of the Dublin Corporation. They would require each township to bring in a Bill itself, which they were not in a position to do, for such a course of procedure would entail great expense; and, beyond that, the Authorities of the townships were not entitled to tax the ratepayers with the expense of bringing forward a Bill in Parliament. In the interest of the small townships, therefore, he would ask them to adhere to the Amendment carried by the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Fitzgerald) on Friday night.

Lord FITZGERALD, in rising to move, as an Amendment, the appointment of a Committee to confer with the Commons on the subject of this difference, said, he most emphatically denied that he had sprung a mine upon the House on Friday, and also, as had been charged against him in some of the newspapers, that he was a resident in one of the townships, or was interested in this question in any personal manner whatever. He declared that he had been induced to take action in regard to the Bill by representations made to him from Dublin, and he strongly protested against the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Waterford) having thrown the weight of the Government into the scale against the townships, and having actually sent out a Government Whip to sustain the Motion against the Amendment. That was not a fair mode of proceeding. The Bill was a private one; and a conflict between the Corporation and the townships was a matter in which the Government should not have interfered, for it was contrary to Constitutional practice. The Corporation sought to get certain advantages for itself, and the townships, in like manner, sought advantages for themselves, which otherwise they could only obtain by coming to Parliament for Local Acts at an enormous expense, which there were no local funds to defray. He maintained that it was not in accordance with the practice of the House that the Government should throw its weight into the scale in such a matter as this without explaining the reasons for it. In neither House of Parliament had he ever known such a course to be pursued. The townships, he would point out, were struggling for a larger supply of water for health and sanitary purposes, and their aspirations seemingly were to be rendered hopeless by the Government issuing a Whip and calling its supporters to oppose them. In face of the serried ranks of the Government opposite, he would appeal to the noble Viscount opposite (Viscount Cranbrook), with whose fairness he was familiar, who said what he thought and thought what he said, as to whether it was the usual course in Parliament for the Government to take one side in reference to a Private Bill and overwhelm the other side? Apart from that question, he very much doubted whether the proper course of dealing with the Bill had been adopted. The Bill was sent back to the House of Commons with two Amendments; and he had always thought that when a Bill was referred back in that way, it was customary to put it before the Committee which had originally considered it, in order to get their opinion of the Amendment. That course had not been followed. However, he supposed it was for their Lordships to assume that, whatever the House of Commons had done, they had done according to their rights. In the ordinary course, when the Commons' Reasons for disagreeing with the Lords' Amendment were sent up to the House of Lords, a Committee should have been appointed to confer with the Lower House to see if some line could not be laid down upon which conflicting opinions could be reconciled. Then, again, the "Reasons" themselves were open to grave discussion. The first was not really a reason why the Amendment should not be assented to, but rather a reason why a Conference should take place, to endeavour to draw some line between the extra water which should be allowed the townships free, and that for which they should be called on to pay. The next "Reason" was a mistake. The Provisional Orders did a great deal more than was there suggested. He thought that if their Lordships examined the Report of the Committee and the evidence taken before them in their Lordships' House, they would say that the noble Marquess had no right to complain of having been taken by surprise in the matter, and that he (Lord Fitzgerald) was perfectly justified in moving the Motion he would now make.

LORD WAVENEY seconded the Amendment.

Amendment *moved,*

To leave out all the words after ("That"), and insert ("this House, insisting on its Amendment, do now proceed to appoint a Committee to meet and confer with a Committee of the Commons").—(*The Lord FitzGerald.*)

THE LORD CHANCELLOR OF IRELAND (Lord ASHBOURNE) said, that this question between the Corporation of Dublin and the townships had been raised almost to the dignity of a great Constitutional question by the speech of the noble and learned Lord (Lord Fitzgerald). That noble and learned Lord had commenced by explaining to their Lordships that he had no personal interest in this matter, and was not actuated by any private motive in the action he was taking. But no one would, for a moment, suppose that the noble and learned Lord had taken action in the matter from other than a deep sense of what appeared to him to be right. As to the reason why his noble Friend (the Marquess of Waterford) had taken up the opposition to the claim of the townships, he (Lord Ashbourne) would remind their Lordships that the noble Marquess had charge of all Provisional Order Bills in that House as representing the Irish Local Government Board, before whom all Provisional Order Bills came to be examined; and it was because the Irish Local Government Board were opposed to this Amendment that the noble Marquess had opposed it. With reference to the suggestion that there should be a Conference between the two Houses of Parliament, he (Lord Ashbourne) said that a Conference was an antique and, though Constitutional, obsolete piece of machinery. He was not aware that there had been any such Conference for many years. In 1881, when there were grave differences of opinion between the two Houses on the subject of the Irish Land Bill, and when the tension was at its highest, he had thought that it would be necessary to resort to the machinery of a Conference. He was told, however, at the time, that Conferences had fallen into disuse. He could not, therefore, treat it as other than an interesting suggestion, when the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Fitzgerald) came forward and gravely put it to their Lordships that, in the matter of the supply of five gallons of water to the population of certain townships, that almost obsolete Constitutional machinery should be revived. He would further call their Lordships' attention to the fact that this Amendment had not come from the parties to the Bill—in fact, he believed it had never occurred to the counsel for the townships to suggest the course which the noble and learned Lord opposite supported—but it had been suggested by the noble Duke opposite (the Duke of Marlborough) and his Colleagues on the House of Lords' Committee, who had thought that it would be a course satisfactory to the townships, and worthy of the consideration of the Dublin Corporation. He (Lord Ashbourne) certainly could say that he was not disposed to disagree with that. The proposal might have been put in a shape worthy of the consideration of both sides; and, in saying that, he was not speaking of the matter as a Member of the Government, but as an Irishman well acquainted with Dublin, and sympathizing very deeply with the townships referred to. That proposal to have assumed a practical form should have been in the nature of a suggestion, to be made the subject of some agreement or negotiation between the Corporation and the townships; but it must be borne in mind that there was only one side of the bargain embodied in the clause rejected by the House of Commons. That clause provided that everything was to be taken from the Corporation and given to the townships, and the townships were to give nothing in return. Was that fair? It could not be regarded as a very satisfactory bargain for the Dublin Corporation; and, therefore, it seemed to him that the first Reason given by the House of Commons was not displaced in the slightest degree. That Reason he regarded as impregnable, unshakeable, unanswerable. He did not, however, attach so much importance to the second Reason, although, no doubt, it was substantially accurate. He would point out to their Lordships, that when the Bill had first come before their Lordships' House, the Members of the Committee to whom it had been referred had used persuasive arguments to show that the Report of the Committee as submitted was not correct, and that the Bill required the insertion of this Amendment. However, the Irish Local Government Board, after due and adequate Notice, had succeeded in carrying its view by a majority of their Lordships, and there the matter should have been allowed to rest. But the noble and learned Lord opposite (Lord Fitzgerald) immediately afterwards, and without Notice, got the first decision of their Lordships reversed, and the Bill went down to the House of Commons. He (Lord Ashbourne) could well imagine how the Commons had felt paralyzed, and, in an agony of doubt as to what they were to do, looking at the conflicting decisions of their Lordships' House on two separate days. They could not lose sight of the fact that the matter came on in a full House of Commons. The matter was one which excited keen interest, for a proposal to tax one class for the benefit of another was a matter which always excited a keen interest in the House of Commons. Without there being the slightest suggestion of surprise, the Bill came on in the ordinary way, and was immediately discussed, and the Chief Secretary for Ireland took exactly the same course there which had been taken in their Lordships' House by the noble Marquess. There were those present who were well able to speak for the townships; but what happened? Why, the first decision of their Lordships was affirmed without a division being taken. Surely that should have an immense effect upon their Lordships, now that they were asked by his noble Friend in charge of the Provisional Order Bill to agree to the Commons' Reason for disagreement with the Amendment. If it could be proved that the 20 gallons of water was an insufficient quantity, and that 25 gallons was necessary for the health and comfort of the district, that argument would certainly be a powerful one in support of the views of the noble and learned Lord. But he (Lord Ashbourne) had in his hand the opinion of a very eminent engineer as to the desirability of adopting the Amendment which the Commons would not accept. That gentleman had declared that it would work pecuniary hardship to the City of Dublin, and give a great benefit, with no pecuniary burden whatever, to the townships. He was of opinion that in the case of those townships 18 gallons per head per day would be a very ample supply; that to supply 25 gallons of water to the townships would be an absurd supply, and would imply bad management and undue waste; and that the effect would be to drain the Vartry of 500,000 gallons of water per day — water which would eventually be wanted.

LORD FITZGERALD: Was that opinion before the Committee?

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord ASHBOURNE): I assume not; but, at all events, there it is.

LORD FITZGERALD: There was a great deal of evidence to the contrary brought before the Committee. The Committee, of course, only dealt with the evidence they had before them.

THE LORD CHANCELLOR (Lord ASHBOURNE) said, he only quoted that opinion as showing that, in addition to the vast inconvenience of seeking to reverse the unanimous opinion of the House of Commons, a most eminent authority was opposed to the Amendment inserted in the Bill.

LORD WAVENEY said, he cordially supported the Amendment of his noble and learned Friend (Lord Fitzgerald); for he thought that that noble and learned Lord knew more about the question than any engineer, who could only speak professionally. He had to complain that the discussion had degenerated so much into a personal matter.

THE DUKE OF MARLBOROUGH said, that as the noble and learned Lord (the Lord Chancellor of Ireland) had mentioned his name, he might, perhaps, be allowed to say a few words in justification of the action he had taken as a Member of the Committee. When he looked at the appearance of the House, he was afraid there was very little chance of his noble and learned Friend (Lord Fitzgerald) carrying his Amendment. But he (the Duke of Marlborough) would ask their Lordships to consider what they would do if they happened to be discussing the affairs of a London Water Company—as, for instance, the Lambeth Water Company, which was discussed the other day, in the other House—instead of the affairs of Dublin. He ventured to think they would not have taken the same course as they had done in this case. The fact was, they seemed to be prejudiced in favour of the Dublin Corporation; and, consequently, not prepared to do justice to the arguments used on the other side. There were several points in the case as it had been presented by the noble and learned Lord who had moved the Amendment which, he (the Duke of Marlborough) thought, were very strong. In particular, there was the argument in regard to the rating of the suburbs, which had largely increased since this agreement was entered into, and the rateable value of the property had increased in a still greater ratio. The consequence was that the Corporation was receiving a much larger revenue from the townships than they had any reason to expect, and it was largely on account of that consideration that the Committee came to the opinion that advantage ought to be taken of this opportunity to protect the townships, not so much against the present, as against the future, rapacity of a powerful Corporation. He cordially supported the Amendment; but, as he had said before, he was afraid the chance of carrying it was very small. He should, however, vote for it on principle.

On Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Motion?"

Their Lordships *divided:* — Contents 21; Not-Contents 10: Majority 11.

Resolved in the *affirmative.*

The Amendment *not insisted* on, and a message sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith.

SEA FISHERIES (SCOTLAND) AMENDMENT BILL.—(No. 247.)

(*The Lord Elphinstone.*)

CONSIDERATION OF COMMONS' AMENDMENTS.

Commons' Amendments *considered* (according to Order).

Lord ELPHINSTONE said, that the Amendments made in the other House were Amendments which had been suggested by the Lord Advocate for Scotland, who was familiar with the subject. He would move that the Commons' Amendments be agreed to.

Moved, "That this House doth agree with the Commons in the said Amendments."—(*The Lord Elphinstone.*)

The Marquess of LOTHIAN said, he thought that there were some rather important Amendments. For instance, the addition which the Commons had made to Clause 2 took away an objection which he had formerly stated to their Lordships. On the whole, he thought the Amendments of the House of Commons made the Bill a much better one than before.

Motion *agreed to;* Commons' Amendments *agreed to* accordingly.

PUBLIC OFFICES SITE ACT, 1882.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

Lord STRATHEDEN and CAMPBELL, in rising to ask Her Majesty's Government, Whether they are ready to postpone further action on the Public Offices Sites Act until the General Election has occurred, said: My Lords, the form of this Question is not very material. It is obviously intended to retard as long as possible the action of the Government on the Public Offices Site Act. The Public Offices Site Act cannot be carried out without the use of funds for demolition and construction. It is under a suspensive veto of the Treasury. What I contend is merely that the suspensive veto ought to be prolonged. None of the plans exhibited last year for a new Admiralty and War Office were considered satisfactory. None of them have been sanctioned, at least by either House of Parliament. The Act may fairly be retarded, because it passed this House by inadvertency and accident. It was intended to divide the House on the third reading, as opinion against the Bill was constantly increasing; but when the third reading came the House was nearly empty. The late Government, last year, adopted cheerfully the counsel which I gave, and which I give their Successors this evening—to take no steps whatever in the autumn with regard to it. The arguments against the Act have often been enumerated by the noble Earl the Chairman of Committees, by the noble Lord (Lord Lamington), and others. The noble Earl opposite (the Earl of Wemyss), although not a Member of this House when the Bill was passing through it, in different forms has actively opposed it. The real fact is, that there was but one pretext for going on with it—namely, the actual insufficiency and inconvenience of the War Office. For that evil a far more prompt and better remedy presents itself than a new edifice which it would take a decade to complete, while millions were absorbed in it. In Spring Gardens most of the houses are transmuted into offices. It might at once give a portion of the War Office the accommodation which is wanted. In that event, the Public Offices Site Act would not have a shadow of foundation, as it tends to destroy the Admiralty, which ought to be preserved; to overshadow the Horse Guards, which ought to be conspicuous; to injure wantonly the residences in Carlton House Terrace, which ought to be defended; and to renounce the Great George Street site, which ought to be embellished and made use of. I do not ask the Government to commit themselves imprudently, but to keep the subject in abeyance until a new Parliament is formed, or until unobjectionable plans have been exhibited. Let me add only that when the Bill passed it could not be urged, as it can at present, that a season of financial deficit is not the moment for ambiguous and unnecessary outlay. The noble Lord concluded by asking the Question of which he had given Notice.

The FIRST LORD of the TREASURY (The Earl of Iddesleigh), in reply, said, that for a considerable number of years there was a strong desire, and, indeed, a necessity, for making better and more commodious arrangements with respect to the Public Offices as regarded the Admiralty and War Offices. The question had been discussed several times, and various plans had been proposed. At last a scheme was prepared by the Government of the day and accepted in the early part of this Session. Indeed, the scheme was practically decided on last year. A Minute was passed by the Treasury, and a scheme prepared settling the terms of competition for the erection of the new Offices. Those terms had been observed, and the persons to whom the award was given were informed that they would be employed, provided Parliament did not dissent from the scheme. The matter was discussed last April, and a division taken by which the scheme was affirmed by a majority of about two to one. The scheme was now in course of execution, and it would not be reasonable or fair to the gentlemen concerned to withdraw from it now. The scheme was undertaken with the perfect consciousness that this was the last Session of Parliament; and the matter having been thoroughly thrashed out, he did not see any reason for postponement. It was proposed at present to go on with the demolition of the buildings it was intended to clear away. That would take some time; and if the new Parliament considered it desirable to make any change in the plans, they would have every opportunity of doing so.

LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART—THE NATIONAL GALLERY—EVENING OPENING.

QUESTION. OBSERVATIONS.

The Marquess of LOTHIAN asked the First Lord of the Treasury, Whether he will make arrangements for the opening of the National Gallery to the public on three evenings in every week? The noble Marquess said, the matter was one of great public interest; and, therefore, he thought it right to put this Question before the Prorogation, in order that during the Recess the National Gallery might be opened as he suggested. It had been frequently before their Lordships, in the form of a proposal for opening these Galleries on Sundays; but they had hitherto refused, rightly he thought in accordance with the preponderance of the opinion of the working classes throughout the country, to sanction the suggestion. These Galleries were as much the property of the working classes as of their Lordships or any other class in the community; but, under existing circumstances, it was exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, for the working classes to take advantage of the Collections which they contained. This they would be able to do, if the Galleries were open in the evening; and he hoped that the noble Earl would give some indication that the suggestion he proposed would be carried out. Though he (the Marquess of Lothian) was not one of those who placed great reliance on the educational influences of Art, he thought it very desirable that the public should have increased means of participating in an innocent and refined pleasure. From 1860 downwards, the House of Commons had repeatedly passed Resolutions in favour of this proposal. There had certainly been very strong reasons against opening Galleries of this kind, because of the detriment to the pictures by the use of gas; but these reasons were now removed by the use of electricity. The South Kensington Museum had been opened in the evening with most satisfactory results; and now that they had the electric light, there was no objection on the score of damage to the pictures from artificial light. Fifty-seven out of the 73 members of the Royal Academy were in favour of opening the Gallery in the evening; and, as they might be considered experts on the subject, he trusted that the noble Earl would see his way to having the proposal carried into effect.

The FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (The Earl of IDDESLEIGH), in reply, said, that the question was, no doubt, one on which there had been a good deal of feeling, and, speaking for himself and, he believed, for many of his Colleagues, they were warmly interested in giving every possible facility to the public for visiting the Gallery, if it could be so arranged. The noble Marquess had asked him (the Earl of Iddesleigh) if he would take steps to that end. But he must point out to the noble Marquess that the matter did not lie with the Treasury, or any Department of the Government, but with the Trustees of the Gallery. They had made some difficulty on the score of expense; but that difficulty was not insuperable. He had not received the noble Marquess's Question till that morning, and, therefore, had not been able to communicate with any of the Trustees. He was not, therefore, able to say more than that the subject was one in which he felt a great interest, and that he would do all he could to promote the object which the noble Marquess had in view. He would certainly communicate with the Trustees of the Gallery. He had obtained an estimate of the cost of lighting the Gallery by electricity, and he did not see anything in it to prevent this proposal from being carried out. If it could be, there was no doubt it would be a great boon to the people of London.

EGYPT—THE SOUDAN EXPEDITIONS—VOTE OF THANKS TO HER MAJESTY'S MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES.

NOTICE OF MOTION.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY: I beg to give Notice that to-morrow, at 2 o'clock, I shall move that the Thanks of this House be given to General Lord Wolseley, General Graham, Lord John Hay, and other officers and men of the Army and Navy, for the skill, courage, and ability with which they conducted the late operations in the Soudan.

House adjourned at a quarter before Six o'clock, till To-morrow, Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Tuesday, 11th August, 1885.

MINUTES.]—PUBLIC BILLS—*Second Reading*—Educational Endowments (Ireland) [176].
Committee — Report — Housing of the Working Classes (England) [248].
Committee — Report — Considered as amended — Third Reading — Prevention of Crimes Amendment [93], and *passed.*
Considered as amended—Third Reading — Land Purchase (Ireland) [249], and *passed.*

QUESTIONS.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—LURGAN UNION—DR. JOHN SCOTT, MEDICAL OFFICER.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Has Dr. John Scott been acting as dispensary doctor of Montagh's Dispensary of Lurgan Union, and has he received his salary by cheque, and does he at same time act as guardian of said union; and, if these facts are correct, will he draw the attention of the auditor to the irregularity?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): I should, perhaps, have added to my previous answer that Dr. John Scott has occasionally acted temporarily for a medical officer, and has been paid for so doing, and that no provision of the Poor Relief or Medical Charities Acts has been thereby infringed.

THE ROYAL IRISH CONSTABULARY—PURSUIT OF POACHERS.

Mr. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Is he aware that a number of police from the Draperstown and Maghera Stations drove by cars to Glenshare Mountain on Sunday last, 2nd inst. in quest of poachers; is he aware that on the same day another lot of police from the Claudy and Park Stations were called off to Glenedera Mountain for the same purpose, the first named place being between Maghera and Dungiven, the last between Draperstown and Feeney, county Derry; ho ware the police paid for this extra duty, and by whom; and, is he aware that a gentleman called at Draperstown Police Station the other day, and requested the sergeant to proceed with him to county Tyrone in pursuit of poachers; the sergeant explained that he could not go into Tyrone without a special order, when the gentleman said he was brother to Mr. Meldon, M.P., was a solicitor in Dublin, and would see that the matter would be looked after in the proper quarter?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke): The police in question did not go in pursuit of poachers, but for the purpose of preserving the peace and protecting gamekeepers from acts of violence while engaged in the discharge of their duty. This is one of the ordinary duties of the police, and involves no cost to the locality. It appears that a gentleman named Meldon called at Draperstown Police Station a few days ago, and made a statement about poachers on Tyrone mountains; but he did not ask the sergeant to accompany him in pursuit, and merely inquired as to the duties of the Constabulary in such cases.

FISHERY PIERS AND HARBOURS (IRELAND)—GREYSTONES HARBOUR.

Mr. O'BRIEN (for Mr. W. J. Corbet) asked the Financial Secretary to the Treasury, If Greystones Harbour is to be constructed on the monolithic system, as asked by the inhabitants of the town in a recent memorial to the Treasury?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Sir Henry Holland): With every wish to meet all reasonable local views, the Government is unable to build the work at Greystones in the style advocated by the hon. Member, as this would involve an estimated increase of £4,000 beyond the cost approved of by the Fishery Piers and Harbours Commission, and an excess of £2,000 even if the design were materially reduced.

COMMISSIONERS OF NATIONAL EDUCATION (IRELAND)—NATIONAL SCHOOL TEACHERS—CASE OF MR. ANDREW DEVITT, PORRELSBOROUGH.

Mr. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether, in 1875, Mr. Andrew Devitt, then teacher of the Porrelsborough National School, which he had taught for nearly 15 years, resigned on condition of being awarded the compensation or retiring allowance usually granted to old teachers before the passing of the Pension Act, namely, one year's salary for every ten years' service; whether the Commissioners of Education having, up to the end of 1877, failed to pay Mr. Devitt the retiring allowance, his case was brought to the notice of Sir Michael Hicks Beach, then Chief Secretary in 1878, with the result that an inquiry was held, and the former managers of the school, Very Rev. Canon O'Donoghue and Mr. Abraham Powell, on calling at the Education Office, were assured by the responsible officials that the money would be paid in the following week; whether the money remains still unpaid; whether the Department is aware that Mr. Devitt, now an old man of 70, is dependent on a few acres of reclaimed bog for the maintenance of his wife and six children; and, whether the Government will order the money withheld to be now paid to him?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): Mr. Devitt resigned on the 30th September, 1875. His manager subsequently applied for a gratuity for him; but as the teacher was under 60 years of age the answer was that a gratuity could only be given on a medical certificate that the teacher was permantly incapacitated. I understand that this certificate has not been furnished. It does not appear that the case was brought to the notice of the Chief Secretary in 1878. This allegation is not borne out either by the records of the Chief Secretary's Office or of the National Board. No grounds have been shown for reviewing the decision in this case.

EDUCATION OFFICE (IRELAND)—THE INSPECTION STAFF.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether any communication took place between the late Government and the Commissioners of National Education, Ireland, with the view of ceasing to fill vacancies in the post of Inspector, and appointing instead Assistant Inspectors at a salary of £120 a-year, being about one-half the minimum salary of an Inspector; and, if such correspondence did take place, what was the result of it; whether there is any intention to appoint, in future, either Inspectors or Assistant Inspectors by nomination, instead of as hitherto by competitive examination; and, whether, in view of the fact that a number of persons have devoted themselves for years to the course of study prescribed for the examination of those desirous to be appointed Inspectors, the Commissioners will now proceed to fill up the vacant Inspectorship in the regular way by the test of competition?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): The present Irish Government are in communication with the Treasury on the subject of the Inspection Staff of the Education Office, but no decision has yet been arrived at. It was never in contemplation either by the present Government, the late Government, or the Board of National Education, to make future appointments of Inspectors or Assistant Inspectors by nomination, instead of as hitherto by competitive examination.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he is aware that, by the rules of the Irish National Board of Education, no result fees are allowed for the fractional part of a month, while class salaries are paid while the school is open; and, whether he will draw the attention of the Commissioners to the different modes of compensation, and suggest the payment for result fees on the same principle as the class salaries?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: The facts are as stated. The salary is a fixed annual sum, and there is no difficulty in calculating the amount per day. But in the case of the result fees, which necessarily vary in every school and after every examination, and the distribution of which is complicated by the differences in the position of the teachers and the number of the subjects and classes taught, there can be no fixed basis on which to compute the amount per day.

POOR LAW (IRELAND)—MR. WIGGINS, MASTER OF THE CLONES UNION WORKHOUSE.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether Mr. Wiggins, Master of Clones Workhouse, is not bound by the rule of the service to give his whole time to his duties in the workhouse; whether he acts as the rent agent of the Reverend Thomas Averill, a local landlord; and, can he, in accordance with the rules of the Local Government Board, continue to act as such rent agent?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): The Local Government Board are informed that Mr. Wiggins receives the rent of some houses in the town of Clones, and that his doing so does not interfere with the discharge of his official duties. There is no specific rule on the subject; but the Board will ask their local Inspector to look into the case.

POOR LAW (IRELAND) — BELFAST UNION WORKHOUSE—CHARGE OF DRUNKENNESS AGAINST THE SCHOOLMASTERS.

MR. BIGGAR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What steps the Local Government Board for Ireland have taken regarding the report furnished them about two schoolmasters of the Belfast Workhouse named Madden and M'Guinness, who were seen in a helpless state of drunkenness on the streets of Belfast on the 14th July, 1885; is it true that, although Madden was assisted by some friends through a back entrance into the workhouse on this date, to the knowledge of the head schoolmaster and other officials of the workhouse, as well as several paupers, no report of Madden's condition was made to the Guardians; is it true that Madden offered a written explanation to the Guardians of his misconduct, and that the Chairman of the Board directed him to withdraw it, so that the document would not require to be entered on the minutes of their proceedings; is Madden the same person who was convicted at the Belfast Petty Sessions of drunkenness and using party expressions; and, is it desirable that schoolmasters of this class should be continued in office; and, if not, what steps will be taken in relation to these two teachers?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): I have already answered this Question, and have nothing to add.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—DETENTION OF INTOXICATED PERSONS.

MR. SEXTON asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, with regard to the recent death of a man whilst in custody in a police barrack, in Sligo, and the undertaking given on the part of the Government during the late Debate, What order has been issued, or will be issued, by the Inspector General of Constabulary, and the Commissioner of Dublin Metropolitan Police, with respect to the safe custody of intoxicated persons, the detention of females, the provision of some light for cells in which persons are kept at night, and the supervision of prisoners in police barracks by the orderly constable on duty; and, whether a copy of any such order or instruction will be communicated to the House?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): It has been decided that a Regulation shall be made by the Inspector General, declaring that, wherever practicable, two drunken prisoners shall not be confined together, and that even when only one drunken prisoner is in charge, he shall be visited constantly, not less than every quarter of an hour, so long as he remains not perfectly sober, and that for this purpose the head constable or sergeant in charge shall, if necessary, tell off an extra barrack orderly. As regards female prisoners, the order will be to the effect that, if drunk, the same rule of visiting as in the case of male prisoners must be observed, and that in all cases when a female is in custody the barrack orderly must not be left in sole charge. The precise terms of the Order have not yet been formulated; but I shall have no objection to communicating them to the hon. Member when they have been settled.

MR. SEXTON thanked the Chief Secretary for his action in this matter.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY—CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMISSION.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether the Memorandum to be submitted to the Commissioners in the Royal Commission on Depression of Trade and Industry would be communicated to the House before the end of the Session?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: My noble Friend (the Earl of Iddesleigh) stated yesterday that he intended to lay the Memorandum on the Table of the House of Lords, and it will also be laid on the Table of this House.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD: It is in the House of Lords' Report to-day.

MR. BROADHURST inquired whether the right hon. Gentleman could now state the name of the second workman to be nominated on the Commission?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I understand that my noble Friend is at present in communication with more than one person upon this subject; but I am not able to state any name at present.

MR. BROADHURST: Will any opportunity be given to the House for the discussion of the composition of this Commission?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: I am afraid, Sir, that I cannot make a promise.

MR. BROADHURST intimated that, in view of the importance of the subject, he should call attention to it on the Motion for the adjournment of the House.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON EDUCATION OF THE BLIND—CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMISSION.

MR. DAWSON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether it is his intention to place an Irishman on the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the Education of the Blind, so that the interests of the blind in that country may be the more efficiently considered and protected?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) (who replied) said, that the Commission was practically appointed by the late Government. He had since placed two Gentlemen on the Commission. If an application from Ireland or Scotland were pressed upon him, he should not object to it.

MR. SEXTON: May I ask the right hon. Gentleman what steps will be taken in order to secure the appointment of one Member from Ireland?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE: If a serious application were made from Ireland or Scotland, I would gladly consider it.

MR. SEXTON: We are quite serious about it.

ADMINISTRATION OF OATHS (CANADA).

MR. BROADHURST asked the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Whether he is aware of the introduction in the Quebec Legislature of a Bill respecting the Administration of Oaths, which requires that a Crucifix shall be placed in all Courts of Justice and Courthouses in the Province, and that all persons administering oaths to witnesses shall call upon them to lift their right hand in front of such Crucifix and to swear before the same; and, whether the Legislature is competent to pass such an Act without the approval of Her Majesty; and, if not, whether Her Majesty will be advised to withhold such approval?

MR. HEALY: Before this very offensive Question is answered, I beg to ask whether it is not a fact that all through France this is the custom pursued in taking oaths; and that in Quebec, which is inhabited by a French Colony, they are simply carrying out the ancient French system?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Colonel STANLEY), in reply, said, he had ascertained that it was a fact, as stated in the Question of the hon. Member for Stoke, that a Bill was introduced into the Quebec Legislature on the 20th of last April; but he was unable to trace it beyond its first reading. The Canadian Legislature was competent to pass such a Bill as this without the approval of the Home Government, and, therefore, he need not answer the last part of the Question. In answer to the hon. and learned Member's (Mr. Healy's) Question, he believed that throughout a great part of France—if not in the whole of France—the custom was that which the hon. and learned Member had stated.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—SOUTH SHIELDS NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

MR. BROADHURST asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether he has made further inquiries into the case of the action of the Vicar of St. Mark's, South Shields, relating to the National Schools under his charge; and, if so, what is the result of these inquiries; and, what, if any, action has been taken by the Education Department?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Mr. E. STANHOPE): The result of further inquiries has been to show that the Vicar's pecuniary difficulties were the cause of some unpunctuality in the discharge of school liabilities; and he has, therefore, been informed that the Education Department cannot for the time continue to recognize him as the correspondent and treasurer of the school in question.

STREET TRAFFIC (METROPOLIS)—OBSTRUCTION IN THE STREETS.

MR. PULESTON asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to the case before the Thames Police Court of obstruction in the public streets by a Parliamentary candidate, on which Mr. Saunders, the magistrate, remarked that he—

> "Thought the defendant was preaching a very mischievous doctrine, and he was endeavouring to set class against class. He (Mr. Saunders) had no doubt that, if the Government liked to take notice of what was stated on the bills the defendant was distributing, he would be amenable to a public prosecution;"

and, whether the Government will inquire into the matter?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS), in reply, said, that after the letter he had received from Mr. Saunders he did not see that there was any reason for taking any further notice of the matter.

ADMIRALTY (FINANCE AND EXPENDITURE)—THE VOTE OF CREDIT—REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF INVESTIGATION.

MR. PULESTON asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, What steps are to be taken on the important Report made by the Committee of Investigation into the financial errors of the late Board of Admiralty?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON), in reply, said, that it was intended to appoint a Committee, consisting of his hon. Friend the Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Ritchie), Sir Reginald Welby (Accountant General of the Navy), and Mr. Macgregor (Permanent Secretary to the Admiralty), to make a Report, with a view of suggesting such alterations as would remedy the defects brought to light.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT—THE LONDON SCHOOL BOARD.

MR. PULESTON asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether, in view of the serious statements in reference to the London School Board finances, and having regard to the present want of authority on the part of the Government to interfere, he will advise some legislation for the protection of the ratepayers?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Mr. E. STANHOPE): The expenditure of the London School Board is only to be controlled in one of two ways. If any item of expenditure is illegal, it is liable to be surcharged by the auditor; and if, in the opinion of the ratepayers, the expenditure of the Board, or any particular item of it, is excessive or deficient in amount, it is in the power of the ratepayers to vote only for those candidates who will give effect to that opinion.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) ACT—ASSISTANT REVISING BARRISTERS.

MR. O'BRIEN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether he is yet in a position to name the Assistant Revising Barristers about to be appointed under the new Registration Act in Ireland?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): I understand that certain gentlemen have been communicated with; but I am not yet able to name them. The list will probably be published in a few days.

MR. O'BRIEN: Will they be announced before the rising of Parliament?

MR. HEALY: Is the right hon. Baronet aware that he promised me that an opportunity would be given for discussing these names before Parliament was over?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY: I will communicate the list of names as soon as possible.

POST OFFICE—POSTAL DELAYS.

COLONEL NOLAN asked the Postmaster General, If his attention has been drawn to the fact that it takes two days to forward a letter from Whitegate to Woodford, about eight miles distant; and if he would take some step to facilitate postal communication between Whitegate and the remainder of the county?

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL (Lord JOHN MANNERS): I am much obliged to the hon. and gallant Member for calling attention to this matter. I have directed inquiries to be made, with a view of remedying the inconvenience complained of.

ARMY—THE ARMY RESERVE.

MR. HARRIS asked the Secretary of State for War, If he will inform the House as to the date at which he thinks the Reserve Forces may reasonably expect to be relieved from their duties; and, if steps could be taken, under any circumstances, for the married men to be allowed to return to their families?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Mr. W. H. SMITH): I hope it will very shortly be in my power to relieve the men of the Reserve from their duties with the Colours for the present, taking such other steps as may be necessary to maintain the defensive Forces of this country in a condition of preparation and efficiency. Furlough has already been granted to men who have had situations kept open for them; and arrangements will be made at once to relieve the married men who may desire to return to their families.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (ENGLAND) —LIST OF VOTERS—WILLESDEN.

MR. GEORGE RUSSELL asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether he is aware that, in the parish of Willesden, part of the Harrow Division of Middlesex, with a population of more than 30,000, the list of occupation voters, which ought to have been published on the 1st of August, was not obtainable on the 8th of August; that, as the last day for making claims and objections is this year the 20th of August, the time prescribed by Law for the examination and correction of the overseers list has thus been already curtailed by one-half; and, whether he can take any steps to remedy the inconvenience thus caused?

THE PRESIDENT OF THE BOARD (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR): I have made inquiry, and am told by the Vestry Clerk that the delay was caused partly by the greatly increased duties thrown on the officials of the parish in connection with obtaining the necessary information, but chiefly by the failure of the printer to furnish complete lists, owing to an injury to his plant. This explanation appears to me to be very unsatisfactory. The lists, I am informed, were obtainable at 1 o'clock to-day.

NAVY—THE EVOLUTIONARY SQUADRON.

SIR JOHN HAY asked the First Lord of the Admiralty, To state what Report he has received of the late Evolutionary Fleet under the command of Sir Geoffrey Hornby; how many armour-clads, in addition to the *Polyphemus*, he has under his orders; their names, their state and condition at the end of the cruise; how many have been removed from the list of efficient ships; how many require repairs; how many require new boilers; and, how many armour-clad ships, complete for sea and fully armed, there are now at home ready to be commissioned?

THE FIRST LORD (Lord GEORGE HAMILTON): The squadron of Sir Geoffrey Hornby consisted of the *Minotaur*, *Sultan*, *Agincourt*, *Iron Duke*, *Devastation*, *Ajax*, *Rupert*, *Hotspur*, *Hercules*, *Shannon*, *Lord Warden*, *Repulse*, and *Penelope*, and his Report does not deal in the way suggested by my right hon. and gallant Friend with the repairs or condition of these iron-clads. Two of them have been removed from the list of efficient ships, and two others, making in all four—namely, the *Lord Warden*, *Repulse*, *Valiant*, and *Defence*, have been replaced by the *Ajax*, *Devastation*, *Rupert*, and *Hotspur*. The squadron generally was reported to be none the worse for the cruise, and no special repairs or new boilers have been necessitated by the cruise. In addition to the iron-clads already in commission, the *Inflexible*, *Northumberland*, *Colossus*, *Bellerophon*, and *Conqueror*, besides the four turret ships, could be commissioned and ready for service in a very short time.

METROPOLIS — LOCAL GOVERNMENT OUTSIDE THE CITY AREA.

MR. FIRTH asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, with reference to the deputation which recently waited upon him from the Corporation of London, Whether he is at liberty and able to state whether any, and what, propositions or suggestions were made by them as to the Local Government of the Metropolis outside the City area?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): No, Sir; I am unable to state what suggestions were made. I do not think, indeed, that any were made, and it seemed to me that they came to find out if I had any to make.

MR. FIRTH: Is the right hon. Gentleman able to state whether he did make any?

[No reply.]

ARMY — MILITARY EXPEDITION TO THE SOUDAN—WIDOWS OF SOLDIERS.

MR. GILES asked the Secretary of State for War, Whether the Government has made or intends to make any provision for the widows and children of soldiers who have been killed or who have died in the Soudan?

THE FINANCIAL SECRETARY, WAR DEPARTMENT (Mr. H. S. NORTHCOTE) (who replied) said: Under the Royal Warrant of the 12th of June, 1884, the Commissioners of the Royal Patriotic Fund are empowered to grant pensions in the case of the widows and children of soldiers who lose their lives in war. Considerable sums were handed over to the Commissioners for that purpose.

NAVAL COURTS MARTIAL — COLLISION BETWEEN THE "HECLA" AND THE "CHEERFUL."

MR. GILES asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether the Coroner's Jury which sat upon the bodies of those persons who were lost by the collision of Her Majesty's ship *Hecla* with the steamer *Cheerful*, was partly composed of the officers on board the *Hecla* at the time of said collision; and, whether the cause of the serious loss of life occasioned thereby will be investigated by an independent tribunal?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS), in reply, said, he was unable to obtain the names of the jurymen; but, as far as an independent inquiry went, he could state to his hon. Friend that the whole case was thoroughly investigated before a court martial, and that the officers of the *Hecla* were stated to have been free from all blame.

CIVIL SERVICE—LOWER DIVISION CLERKS AND WRITERS.

MR. PULESTON asked Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Whether he has been able to consider the Memorials presented to the Treasury on behalf of the Lower Division clerks, and the Civil Service writers, and others, under the Playfair scheme, asking for a Parliamentary inquiry; and, if so, whether he will advise that a Committee of this House be granted early next Session?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The Memorial of the Lower Division clerks, which has recently been received, will be considered by the Treasury; that of the Civil Service writers has been referred to the Civil Service Commissioners, by whom the Regulations affecting them are administered. I am sorry to say that I have not yet been able to give to this important subject the attention it deserves; and, therefore, I should not like to give a definite promise with reference to the appointment of a Committee next year to inquire into the working of the Playfair scheme; but I am disposed to think that such an inquiry would be desirable. It is proposed to obtain Reports from the different Departments as to the working of the scheme, so that the replies received would form a basis for the investigation of such a Committee if appointed.

MR. PULESTON asked, would the inquiry deal with the particular case of the Civil Service writers?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: Yes, Sir; that is so.

MR. TOMLINSON asked, would the case of the Inland Revenue officers with the Excise Department be included?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: So far as I am aware that matter has been settled.

CATTLE IMPORTATION—CANADIAN AND AMERICAN CATTLE.

MR. DUCKHAM asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether the following arrangement, as announced in the newspapers of last week, has received the sanction of the Privy Council, viz.:

> "Sir J. B. Lawes, bart. has accepted Mr. Moreton Frewen's offer of 50 head of lean stock from Wyoming to feed and fatten in England;"

and, whether any, and, if so, what, precautionary measures will be enforced to guard against the introduction of contagious diseases by those animals, seeing that the Canadian Government deem it requisite to prohibit the transit of cattle from Wyoming through Canada as a precaution against the introduction of contagious and fatal diseases?

MR. ALBERT GREY asked the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, Whether it is the case that cattle from the United States are received without any quarantine into Canada at Sarnia, and are carried 400 miles through Canada to Montreal; whether cattle are constantly admitted into the North West of Canada from the United States without any quarantine; whether Montana Ranchemen are in the habit of driving their cattle to Maple Creek on the Canadian Pacific Railroad, and conveying them eastward by that road; whether, in reply to Lord Derby last year, Lord Lansdowne stated that, after inquiry, it appeared that the territories of Wyoming and Montana were found to be free from contagious disease; and, whether it is true, as stated by *Land and Water*, of 8th August, that—

> "Last year some very large consignments of United States cattle were made by the new outlet northward by trail to Maple Creek, on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and thence eastward over the line, *viâ* Winnipeg, to St. Paul and Chicago. It is now proposed to afford a better service between the Montana ranches and eastern American markets by building a line of railway from Medicine Hat, a thriving town in the Canadian North-West, on the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, southwards to Fort Benton, Montana, a distance of 155 miles, and thus make Medicine Hat the point of joining the rails, instead of Maple Creek. The export live cattle and sheep trade of Canada continues this season to grow."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY (Mr. CHAPLIN): It will be for the convenience of the House if I answer the two Questions separately; and in reply to the hon. Member for Hereford (Mr. Duckham) I have to say that no arrangement of the kind mentioned has been sanctioned by the Privy Council, nor have they received any communication or information on the subject. The hon. Member for South Northumberland (Mr. A. Grey) asks me six Questions, which I shall be glad to answer to the best of my ability. But they have involved researches into papers, some of them extending as far back as 1880, and I confess I should have been glad of a somewhat longer Notice of the inquiries. In reply to the first, by an Order of the Canadian Privy Council, passed in 1880, the importation into Canada, excepting the North-Western States, of animals from the United States was prohibited. That order is still in force, the only exception being that animals are allowed under certain conditions to pass through Canada in bond from one part of the United States territory to another. In virtue of that exception, it is true that cattle are received into Canada at Sarnia, and are carried as far as Lynn, not Montreal, and from there they are taken on for shipment to United States ports. In reply to the second, cattle are not constantly admitted into Canada from the United States, excepting from extreme western points in Alberta and Assiniboia, near the Rocky Mountains, and then only subject to strict regulations as to their sanitary condition. As to the third, I have been unable to obtain information as to the practice of the Montana Ranchemen in driving their cattle to Maple Creek, and thence conveying them eastward. But if that is so, I apprehend it is only for the purpose of transit from one part of the State to another. In reply to the fourth, the only statement I can find from Lord Lansdowne is a negative statement, contained in a despatch to Lord Derby of September, 1884, in two paragraphs, to this effect—

> "The result of the investigations which have recently been instituted by the desire of the Minister of Agriculture has been to satisfy him that, although there is no evidence to show that infectious disease at present exists in Wyoming, Montana, and Colorado, pleuro-pneumonia has undoubtedly manifested itself in Illinois."

And then he goes on to say—

> "In view of this state of things, the Dominion Government have come to the conclusion that the moment would be a very inopportune one for a relaxation of the precautions against the admission of disease."

I have no information as to the truth of the newspaper paragraph referred to in the fifth Question; and in reply to the sixth, the exports of cattle and sheep from Canada in 1884 showed a falling off of some 25,000 animals since 1883. In regard to this year, I regret that I really have not had time to complete the comparison week by week, which would be necessary between this year and last year, since I saw the Notice of the hon. Member's Question.

MR. BRODRICK asked the right hon. Gentleman whether Her Majesty's Government would use their influence with the Dominion Government to induce them to allow these cattle to be imported into Canada?

MR. STAVELEY HILL asked the right hon. Gentleman whether he would ascertain whether these cattle could be brought into this country at a remunerative price?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY: I apprehend, Sir, that the first duty of the Government is to ascertain whether cattle can be imported without risk of introducing disease; and, viewing the question in that light, I am unable to give an answer in the affirmative to the Question of the hon. and learned Gentleman. We have reason to believe that at the present time American store stock could not be imported into this country with a due regard to safety.

COLONEL NOLAN wished to know whether the Government had received any Report from veterinary surgeons to the effect that lean or store cattle would be less likely to introduce disease than fat cattle?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE DUCHY said, he was not aware that they had received any such information.

ALLOTMENTS EXTENSION ACT, 1882—FOLKESTONE CHARITY LAND.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, If he is aware that the Trustees of the Folkestone Charity Land refuse to carry out the provisions of the Allotments Extension Act, 1882, and are demanding prohibitory rents for the land; if he has seen the following statement in *The Folkestone News*:—

> "The rent asked is too high, the object being, no doubt, to discourage applicants, and then to show that the land was not required;"

and, whether the Charity Commissioners will compel the Trustees to offer the lands at such rents, and under such conditions, as the Act directs?

THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (Mr. E. STANHOPE): The Trustees do not refuse to carry out the provision of the Allotments Extension Act, so far as relates to giving the notices under Section 4, and those notices have been given. The rent asked is 1*s.* 2*d.* per rod, and, regarded simply as an agricultural rent, is, of course, very high; but I am not able to say whether the position of the land as regards Folkestone, or any other circumstances, make it a fair rent. If complaint is made that the Trustees have failed to comply with the provisions of the Act, the Charity Commission inform me that they will take the steps prescribed in that case by Section 10 of the Act.

SIR EDWARD WATKIN asked whether there was not a discussion going on between the Trustees and the owners of land a little further afield with a view to solve the difficulty, which entirely depended upon the fact that the land proposed to be used for these small holdings was really building land, which ought to be sold for the benefit of the particular charities?

MR. JESSE COLLINGS asked whether the Trustees did not a few months ago offer land at 7*d.* per rod, or £4 13*s.* 4*d.* an acre; and whether they did not raise the rent to 1*s.* 2*d.* per rod, or double the price, on finding that it was eagerly sought for; also whether the clerk to the Trustees had not let a portion of the land to his own relatives at a farm rental?

THE VICE PRESIDENT said, that he had no information whatever before him tending to support the allegations contained in the Questions of the hon. Member for Ipswich. He thought it was extremely probable that what the hon. Baronet the Member for Hythe (Sir Edward Watkin) stated was the case.

METROPOLITAN WATER COMPANIES.

GENERAL SIR GEORGE BALFOUR asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether Her Majesty's Government will cause a statement to be prepared, for the information of the next Parliament, showing the capital, including loans and debentures, the gross income, working expenses, and net divisible profits of the Metropolitan Water Companies for the years 1880 to 1884 inclusive; and a comparative statement showing the amount the Companies would respectively have received, in the same years, under the provisional agreements of the late Mr. Edmund James Smith, as embodied in "The Metropolitan Waterworks Purchase Bill, 1880," and showing the capital, including loans and debentures, of each Company, as it stood at the date of the provisional agreements; and a statement of the amount of capital expended upon new works during the same period?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS), in reply, said, that a Return had been presented to Parliament giving the information required by the hon. and gallant Member.

LAW AND POLICE—ELIZA ARMSTRONG, A CHILD UNDER 14 YEARS.

Mr. CAVENDISH BENTINCK asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether his attention has been called to an article in *Lloyd's Weekly Newspaper* of the 9th instant, headed "A Mother's Search for her Child," and referring to the alleged disappearance of Eliza Armstrong, a girl under fourteen years of age; and, whether he has directed any inquiry to be made with reference to this matter; and, if so, with what result?

Mr. HOPWOOD, before the right hon. Gentleman answered the Question, wished to ask him whether the offences of decoying a child under 14 and of receiving a child so decoyed were not felony under the existing law, under which the parties might be prosecuted?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross): Yes, Sir; they are. My attention has been called to this case, and I have instituted a number of inquiries. As the result I have thought it my duty to take the opinion of the Attorney General.

RECREATION GROUNDS—WOODCOTE GREEN, BROMSGROVE.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, If he is aware that the Land Commissioners, by their award signed July 5th, 1855, gave a piece of land, being a part of Woodcote Green, and containing two acres, to the Earl of Shrewsbury, to be held by him and his heirs in trust as a place of recreation for the inhabitants of Bromsgrove; whether he is aware that the Earl of Shrewsbury is now letting the land and taking the rents for the same; and, whether the Land Commissioners will direct the Trustee to carry out the award, and restore the land to the people of Bromsgrove to be used as a recreation ground?

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross), in reply, said, he believed it was quite true that in 1855 an award was made giving the land in question to the Earl of Shrewsbury, to be held by him and his heirs, in trust, as a place for the exercise and recreation of the inhabitants of Bromsgrove. That was done under the general Inclosure Act, 1845. What the Earl of Shrewsbury had done he did not know, as he knew nothing about the facts; but the Commissioners informed him that if the facts were as stated in the Question they had no power at all to direct the present owner of the land to act as suggested in the Question. He might inform the hon. Member that since the passing of the Act of 1876 no more land could be allotted as had been the case here.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS asked if he rightly understood that the Earl of Shrewsbury had deliberately put aside the award, and that the Land Commissioners refused to enforce their award?

The SECRETARY of STATE: The Commissioners say they have no jurisdiction to direct the present owner of the land as suggested in the Question.

THE CHARITY COMMISSIONERS' SCHEMES—LABOURERS' ALLOTMENTS.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS asked the Vice President of the Committee of Council, Whether the Charity Commissioners will issue and make public a list of the Schemes sanctioned by them, in which they have omitted to insert provisions for allotments, so that the agricultural labourers and others interested may have an opportunity of applying to the Commissioners to remedy their error by the insertion of such provisions in amended Schemes?

The VICE PRESIDENT of the COUNCIL (Mr. E. Stanhope): It is the practice of the Charity Commissioners to provide in their scheme that every person interested in the Charity may have access to the scheme, and in any case where he may be unable to do so the Commissioners are ready to afford every information. I will personally look into the list of schemes mentioned by the hon. Member, in order to see if there is any case where amendment appears to be necessary; but I cannot, as at present advised, publish the list.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—AFFRAY IN COUNTY MONAGHAN.

Mr. HEALY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, What are the facts with regard to the attack made by an armed Orange Expedition on some Catholics in county Monaghan on Thursday last; what is the condition of the wounded man whom they fired on; is it usual for bail to be taken, as in this case, for persons accused of attempted murder against the expressed wish of the police authorities; will the Government give instructions that armed bands cannot be allowed to proceed through the country in the way these Orangemen have done, letting off shots and using insulting expressions amongst a Catholic population; is it true, as stated in *The Freeman's Journal* of August 10th, that the leaders of the rioters were Dr. Hall, Medical Officer to the Monaghan Workhouse; Mr. John Johnson, Deputy Clerk of the Peace for Monaghan; and Mr. Jackson, J.P., Manager of the Bank of Ireland, Castleblayney; if so, will persons holding official positions be retained in the public service; and, will the Government consider the advisability of indicting the organisers of the movement on a charge of conspiracy to murder?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE): As proceedings are at present pending against three men in connection with this affair, I am advised that it would not be right for me to make any statement in reference thereto, or to the conduct of any person connected with it. The legal questions involved will be dealt with by the Attorney General in due course when the depositions shall have been sent to him by the Crown Solicitor. I understand the wounded boy is progressing favourably.

MR. HEALY: Would the right hon. Baronet have any objection to state whether these three men who are referred to—Dr. Hall, Medical Officer of the Monaghan Workhouse; Mr. John Johnson, Deputy Clerk of the Peace for Monaghan; and Mr. Jackson, J.P., Manager of the Bank of Ireland, Castleblayney—were the leaders of this armed band; and, whether persons occupying official positions would be allowed to parade through the country at the head of an organization of this kind with arms?

THE CHIEF SECRETARY said, he could add nothing to what he had said.

THE ELECTORAL ACTS—DISTRIBUTION.

SIR HENRY JAMES asked the Secretary of State for the Home Department, Whether he would take steps to have the new Electoral Acts, the Franchise Act, the Redistribution Act, and the Registration Acts at once printed and distributed? Before the change of Government a promise was made that those Acts should be distributed at an early period, so as to be in the hands of all concerned before the General Election.

MR. BRODRICK suggested that the new Corrupt Practices Act should also be issued.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he should take care that was carried out as soon as possible. With regard to the further Question, the Corrupt Practices Act could be bought at the Queen's Printers.

MOTIONS.

——o——

PARLIAMENT — BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—THE PROROGATION—MINISTERIAL STATEMENT.

MR. CHAMBERLAIN: With reference to the Notice which stands in the name of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in regard to suspending the Standing Orders to-morrow, I wish to ask the right hon. Gentleman what Business he proposes to take then; and whether he will, as I believe has always been customary, give a pledge that the Government will move the adjournment of the House to-morrow as soon as the Government Business is disposed of?

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: When the right hon. Gentleman rose I was about to make the Motion of which I had given Notice—namely, that the Standing Orders relating to Wednesday Sittings be suspended to-morrow. I propose this, of course, with the view of winding up the Business of the Session; and I think the right hon. Gentleman is quite within his rights in asking for such an undertaking as he has suggested, and which I am prepared to give. I have communicated with the noble Marquess opposite (the Marquess of Hartington), who has, as is the customary practice, undertaken to second the Vote of Thanks to Her Majesty's Forces for their services in the Soudan; and I have ascertained that it would be more convenient for many reasons that the Vote should be proposed to-morrow instead of Thursday. I therefore propose that the House should meet, if my Resolution is carried, at 3 o'clock to-morrow. The first Business will be the Vote of Thanks to Her Majesty's Forces for their services in the Soudan; and then we shall proceed with any Business on the Paper that may not be completed to-night, with the Report and remaining stages of the Irish Land Purchase Bill, and with the Report on the Housing of the Working Classes Bill, if the Committee should, as I anticipate, conclude to-night. Then there is another Bill which also stands on the Paper, to which I observe there is no opposition—the Educational Endowments (Ireland) Bill. That Bill has passed the House of Lords; and if it is read a second time to-night, I hope we shall be able to take the Committee and final stages to-morrow. That would leave no further Business for the House to consider. In that case we might possibly be able to adjourn over Thursday, and the Prorogation might take place on Friday or Saturday, at the latest. These arrangements, of course, depend upon the progress made to-night and to-morrow. I therefore make the formal Motion that the Standing Orders in regard to Wednesday Sittings be suspended.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Standing Orders relating to Wednesday Sittings be suspended To-morrow."—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN thought the House would not object to the Motion of the right hon. Gentleman. Such a Motion was quite reasonable, and according to precedent. He only wished it to be made perfectly clear that when the Business to which the right hon. Gentleman had referred, or such of it as was not concluded that night, had been dealt with, he would then, on behalf of the Government, move the adjournment of the House, and that no other Business would be taken.

Mr. COLERIDGE KENNARD hoped he might be permitted to put in a plea for the Police Enfranchisement Bill. Two years had been engaged in enfranchising people, and it would be hard if they were to separate without bestowing some slight attention on this important subject. They might reject the Bill if they pleased; but he appealed to the Government to give the House an opportunity of discussing it.

Mr. BRYCE hoped that the right hon. Gentleman would also take into his consideration the Infants Bill, which had passed the House of Lords, and which had received the approval of the highest Legal Authorities in the other House.

Mr. SEXTON pointed out that the Lords had made considerable Amendments in the Labourers (Ireland) Bill; and he wished to know if those Amendments would be taken into consideration to-morrow?

Mr. BRODRICK endorsed the appeal of the hon. Member for Salisbury (Mr. Coleridge Kennard), with reference to the Police Enfranchisement Bill. He had lately addressed a number of meetings in different parts of the country, and was in a position to say that there was a very strong feeling in favour of taking the sense of the House upon the measure. If that was not done the attitude of hon. Gentlemen opposite with regard to it would be misinterpreted at the Election.

Sir HENRY JAMES said, they must take their chance of being misinterpreted; but the remarks of the hon. Member explained the action of some of the supporters of this Bill, who were anxious that their views should not be misinterpreted. He hoped the House would not regard this as a Party question; but he wished to point out that in the present condition of the House it was impossible to obtain an adequate expression of opinion on this Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER interposed, and said that on the Motion now before the House it was out of Order to discuss the provisions of particular Bills.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in reply to the main question, reminded the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce) that the death sentence on his little Bill had been pronounced by the right hon. Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain). It would be quite impossible for him to give special favours to the hon. Gentleman as against other hon. Members. For the same reason he was afraid that he could not do anything with regard to the Police Enfranchisement Bill. He sympathized largely with his hon. Friend (Mr. Coleridge Kennard) in the efforts which he had made to obtain the consideration of his Bill by the House. If he had been more fortunate in that respect he (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) believed that the Bill would have been carried by a considerable majority; but he would remind his hon. Friend that even if it came on to-morrow, it was hardly possible that it could become law in the very limited time that remained of the present Session. Of course, the Government Business to-morrow would include the consideration of the Lords' Amendments to the Labourers' (Ireland) Bill, and at the close of the Government Business he would move the adjournment of the House.

MR. BRYCE explained that the Infants Bill had already passed the House of Lords.

Motion *agreed to.*

PARLIAMENT—THE NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE (RULE 2)—ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE—THE ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY—COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION.

MR. BROADHURST: I beg, Mr. Speaker, to ask leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the hon. Gentleman name the subject?

MR. BROADHURST: The composition of the Royal Commission on Trade and Industry.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member for Stoke has asked leave to move the Adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite question of urgent public importance—namely, the composition of the Royal Commission on Trade. Is it your pleasure that leave be given? [*Cries of* "No, no!"]

The pleasure of the House not having been signified, Mr. SPEAKER called on those Members who supported the Motion to rise in their places, and less than 40 Members having risen in their places the House proceeded to the Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

——o——

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (ENGLAND) BILL [*Lords*].—[BILL 248.]

(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

MR. ALDERMAN W. LAWRENCE said, he should gladly support the Bill, although he feared it would not do as much good as might be expected. Believing, as he did, that the need of the working classes in the matter of dwelling-houses was urgent, and would brook no further delay, he could not join with those who wished the matter postponed until such time as the local government question could be adequately dealt with. If this smaller measure were rejected it might, perhaps, be a very long time before a larger measure would be carried; whereas, if this Bill were passed, it would be easy to extend its provisions if they were found to work satisfactorily. It was, in his opinion, absolutely necessary that the dwellings for the working classes should be built upon plans that would afford reasonable remuneration to the builders, because it would be impossible to carry out the proposals of philanthropists if the dwellings were erected at a loss. Railways had been compelled by Act of Parliament to carry third-class passengers for a fixed sum in covered carriages; and the result had been that the revenue derived by Railway Companies from their third-class passengers was more than double that which they obtained from their first and second-class traffic put together. The same principle would apply in building; and, therefore, he hoped that the sites of the prisons would be handed over to the Metropolitan Board of Works for the purpose of erecting dwellings for the working classes. The theory that had been put forward that the poorer classes had been displaced simply for Metropolitan purposes was an utterly erroneous one; because the construction of railways and the erection of the Royal Courts of Justice, by which thousands of poor people had been deprived of their homes, had been undertaken for the benefit of the community at large, and not merely for the benefit of the Metropolis. He wished, however, to point out that the chief obstacle to the erection of proper dwellings for the working classes in London was the House Tax, which prevented the construction of houses of more than two stories; and until they removed the House Duty they would not give Free Trade fair play in the matter of providing houses for the working classes. On the whole, he had great pleasure in supporting the Bill as a step in the right direction.

MR. J. G. HUBBARD said, he gave the Bill his hearty support. There was no object better entitled to be assisted in every way by the State than the proper housing of the working classes. Parliament had already sanctioned the aid of the State being given for the construction of harbours of refuge, and for the purposes of education; and he could see nothing mischievous, or injudicious, or ill-timed in this proposal of the Government to throw the influence of its wealth and its credit in the direction of improving the dwellings of the working classes. The Government, it appeared, were willing to make loans at 3⅛ per cent. The clause carrying out this intention was, however, framed so as to give rise to a good deal of ambiguity and uncertainty, for it provided that 3⅛ per cent should be the minimum rate of interest, but that the Treasury should fix the rate at such a figure as to enable such loans to be made without loss to the Exchequer. He should strongly recommend the Government to strike these words out, which really meant nothing at all, but which would lead to much uncertainty. As to the Inhabited House Duty, he agreed with the hon. Alderman that it involved extreme hardships, and that there were great irregularities in the manner in which it was enforced. It was not chargeable on houses of less than £20 value. The law should be so altered that large blocks of houses let out in tenements at less than £20 a-year each should also be exempted from House Duty. This tax was really a very anomalous one. It amounted to 9*d.* in the pound, while the Income Tax was 8*d.* This was a duplication of taxation on property which he hoped would soon be removed when the whole system of taxation was reviewed. He hoped that the buildings erected under this Bill would be exempted from House Duty, for this would give some impetus to its provisions. He was of opinion that the provision with regard to the disused sites of Metropolitan prisons was an admirable one, as it would enable areas formerly used for housing criminals to be used for the erection of dwellings so arranged and constructed that they would tend to prevent people from becoming criminals. To the Bill generally he gave his heartiest support; for until this question of overcrowding was dealt with we should never get that social amelioration, domestic comfort, and decency without which that improvement in morals which they were all desirous to see was absolutely impossible.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, he disagreed with the President of the Local Government Board, who denied that the question of leaseholds had anything to do with this question of the housing of the working classes. In Vienna the average number of persons in each house was 60. In Paris it was 29, whereas in London it was 8. The smallness of the number in London was due, in his humble opinion, in no small degree, to the leasehold system prevailing in the Metropolis. If it had not been for that system, the houses of the Metropolis would probably have resembled those of Paris and Vienna, where the different classes of society were brought more together than here, a circumstance which was very favourable indeed to the advance of civilization. It had been urged in support of the provision with regard to the prison sites that there had been a great displacement of labourers in London on account of the erection of public buildings; but this might be said in respect to all large towns. On the other hand, London artizans had derived an immense advantage from the Underground Railway, which provided them with a very cheap and rapid mode of conveyance to the scene of their work. He could not see that London had any special claim for this State subvention which the Bill proposed to grant. There was in Lancashire a great deal of land belonging to the Crown and to the Duchy of Lancaster, and the inhabitants of the large towns in Lancashire would have just as strong a claim to obtain some of that land upon similar terms to those which this Bill proposed in respect to the prison sites. He pointed out that the Prime Minister in this Bill was unconsciously adhering to the theory of ransom, but with this difference—that the Government of the noble Lord proposed to pay ransom with the property of the State, whereas the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) proposed to pay ransom with their own property. He was sorry that this notion should prevail; and he was glad to think that on the Motion of the hon. Member for

South Northumberland (Mr. Albert Grey) they would have an opportunity of expressing their opinions definitely on this subject. The Home Secretary referred to Clause 13, in regard to which, in its original form, and still more in the form in which he proposed to amend it, there were very grave objections. Last year the Police and Sanitary Committee had dealt with the condition in which unfurnished houses were let; and in the present Session they had sanctioned, in the case of several Bills applying to important Corporations, the introduction of clauses which provided that there should be no letting of any house for the purpose of human habitation without an entry by the officers of the Corporation and a certificate of the Sanitary Authority. Suppose the clause of the right hon. Gentleman should be passed, what was to be its operation? Did he believe that it would be operative? He could scarcely think it possible. What would be its operation in those towns possessing the power of granting a certificate? Was the Imperial law to govern, or was the certificate of the sanitary officer? He was of opinion that this proposal would introduce great difficulty. He protested strongly against the opinion that there could be made on the part of the working classes of London any claim whatever for this proposed subvention which could not be equally advanced on the part of the working classes of any or all of the great cities of the United Kingdom.

Mr. WARTON said that, in his opinion, the effect of the provision dealing with the condition of unfurnished houses would be to injure the value of house property. He thought they were in danger with such a provision as this of being beset by sanitary experts, who would bring forward their peculiar crotchets and remedies with respect to sewers and drains. Within the last few days he had presented 127 Petitions from building societies protesting against the Bill. He called attention to the immense amount of capital invested by working men out of their hard-won earnings in building societies. The last Return dealing with these investments, which came down to December, 1883, stated that the assets of building societies amounted to more than £51,000,000. He was inclined to think, however, that in round numbers there were £70,000,000 invested in such undertakings as those with which the Bil professed to deal, and the working men through the building societies were doing by voluntary efforts what this Bill sought to make compulsory. The working men said that they had invested their savings in these societies and that they were ratepayers, and they protested against the Bill on the ground that it interfered with local action. The point to which they wished to call especial attention was that referring to the selling of the prison sites under the market value; and they said that if this was done the fact of the land being so obtained would conflict with and would be in opposition to their efforts which had been carried on for so many years. Taking a broad and general view of the Bill, he looked upon it as evidence that the Tory Party showed the real concern they had for the welfare of the industrial classes. He regarded the Bill principally as a proof to the working classes of this country that the Tory Party was quite as much if not much more anxious than the Liberal Party to do everything which would tend to the welfare of the working classes. It was an effort to carry out the policy inaugurated by the late Lord Beaconsfield — *sanitus sanitatum* — and he thought it could not be placed in better hands than those of the right hon. Gentleman (Sir R. Assheton Cross), who was instrumental in the passing of the Artizans' Dwellings Act, which had been so great a boon to the working classes.

Mr. BRYCE said, that the improvements which were needed in order to bring the dwellings of the working classes into a satisfactory state were so numerous and varied, and must be the result of so many converging influences and agencies, that it was practically impossible for any one measure to deal with the question. He was glad that the Government had brought forward this Bill, even at the end of the Session, and that they should be now pushing it forward in order to become law. It was not a Bill easy to criticize. It was far from being a comprehensive measure; it was a straggling, rambling kind of Bill; it touched a great variety of topics, making a little improvement here and making a little excision there; but it was difficult to frame a Bill of this kind otherwise. He hoped hon. Members who wished to introduce Amendments would now be chary of doing so, because they might overweight the Bill and raise new questions which the House was not in a position adequately to discuss. He did not think it was possible to go on much longer without a considerable amendment of the Buildings Acts. They had not sufficiently provided for the erection of proper sanitary dwellings in London, and especially with reference to the providing of open spaces and recreation grounds in every district covered with houses of the poor. In regard to the provision dealing with the prison sites, he urged the Government to withdraw it. He could assure the Government that nothing would so much facilitate the passing of the Bill and disarm all antagonism to it as a concession on this point. The right hon. Gentleman admitted that that Bill was only an instalment, and that it would probably have to be supplemented next year. Therefore, there was no urgency for dealing now with that part of the measure, which really required more consideration than it could receive at that period of the Session. With regard to the centralizing portion of the Bill, he thought that the Amendment which the Home Secretary proposed to introduce would, on the whole, sufficiently meet that difficulty. In London the Local Authorities were not adequate for the discharge of the duties cast upon them, many districts being so poor that there were few persons with the leisure, education, and experience which fitted them to perform public duties. They also wanted that public spirit which existed in the provincial towns, and they were not controlled in the same way by public opinion and the Press as was the case in other large industrial centres. Therefore, he admitted that there were reasons why Local Authorities in London required a stimulus from the Central Authority. At the same time, the establishment of a proper system of Municipal Government for London ought to be pressed forward at the earliest possible moment. Turning to the subject of the subvention from the State which it was now proposed to give, he understood that the Home Secretary was not able to give them an estimate of the amount of the subsidy which was to be received from the State in respect to those prison sites in London. It was said that the amount would be small; but, even if that were so, the principle involved was a large one. They were about to embark in a system of State subventions for the provision of dwellings for the working classes. They were told, indeed, that the present case was not to be drawn into a precedent; but everything of that kind was almost certain to be drawn into a precedent, and was all the more likely to be so under a new Democratic Parliament. He treated that proposal, therefore, as the introduction of the principle of State intervention to find dwellings for the working classes below cost price. Supposing the land on which the prison stood was worth £10,000 an acre, and it was sold under the Bill to the Metropolitan Board of Works for £8,000 an acre, that would be a subsidy on the part of the State to the amount of £2,000 per acre. How was the Metropolitan Board of Works to deal with the dwellings to be built on these sites? Was it to let them at the ordinary market price? If it did it would make a profit corresponding to the difference between paying £8,000 and £10,000 per acre. Was it intended that the Metropolitan Board should become a landlord making a profit? That was a very undesirable function for it to assume.

The PRESIDENT of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. Balfour) explained that he had never suggested that the dwellings erected on the prison sites should be let below the market value.

Mr. BRYCE said, then he did not see the advantage of selling the site below the market price unless they were to let the dwellings below the market price. On the other hand, if the dwellings were let below the proper market rate the influx of people into London would be encouraged, and the great evils arising from the undue pressure of population would be stimulated. In the next place, that would tend to lower the rate of wages, and, further, it would discourage and drive out of the market private enterprize. The owners of workmen's dwellings, and particularly the Companies which now provided them, would not be able to supply those dwellings at the price they had previously done, because they would find themselves undersold by the Metropolitan Board of

Works, or by those to whom it gave the land. That disturbance of the market rate and that interference with private enterprize would tell most upon the best class of landlords. The bad class of landlords now made a large percentage upon their capital by admitting to their dwellings a far greater number of inmates than they ought to do. Companies such as that with which the hon. Member for Gravesend (Sir Sydney Waterlow) was connected refused to do so; and, therefore, they did not obtain so large a percentage on their capital as that other class of landlords. The competition of the Metropolitan Board of Works would tell most against the better class of landlords who built proper sanitary dwellings. Under present conditions, as was shown by evidence that had been taken, perfectly good and healthy dwellings, containing no more than the proper number of inmates, could be provided, and yet be made to pay 5 or 6 per cent on the capital invested in them. He knew a case of a Company formed for the purpose of providing dwellings for the poor, and that Company was able to do so, and at the same time to pay a dividend of 4½ to 5 per cent. If that Company went on, and others like it were formed, this great problem was practically solved, because, in return for a dividend of 4½ per cent, almost an unlimited amount of capital could be commanded. But if the competition of the State came in and disturbed private enterprize, and lowered the dividend to 3½ per cent, no capital would be obtainable from private sources. He submitted that all these facts furnished very grave reasons why the House should pause in this case. There was, he contended, an abundant spirit of philanthropy in the country, which only required to be guided and directed wisely; but by passing this measure into law Parliament would paralyze the efforts of the philanthropist, and, in fact, prevent his taking action at all. They ought not to be discouraged, or to rush into violent remedies in this matter. All improvements in the condition of the poorer classes of the community must be gradual, and must result from the growth of better habits among the working classes themselves; they must depend upon moral as well as material improvements. He had had considerable experience in these matters for some 15 years, and he could assert that there was a steady and real progress going on towards a better state of things —a progress which was brought about by the agency of education, the growth of temperance, the repression of crime, and by the coming of the rich among the poor. Let them have laws on the subject and strengthen them, and see that they were strictly enforced, and after that let them take all such steps as might properly be taken to attract voluntary efforts into this good work; but they must not come forward and supersede the agencies now at work by substituting the action of the State for that of private enterprize.

MR. PELL said, he desired to call the attention of the House to the Bill as it affected rural districts, where there was, at any rate, as much attention, if not more, paid to sanitary matters than in towns. First of all he would point out that the Bill was going to apply all the provisions of the Lodging House Acts from 1851 to 1867 in the rural districts; and he thought the House should carefully consider whether such application would not do an injustice to the poor rather than confer a benefit, and whether these objectionable provisions would not have the effect of rendering the whole of the Bill inoperative so far as country districts were concerned. He did not consider that the Bill touched the evil which the agricultural community complained of. Bad houses were generally found in the open villages, into which the people were crowded from the close parishes in which they were employed. If their homes were improved, still the men would be left with three or four miles to walk to their work. Again, if the provisions of this Bill were adopted for any parish, Boards of Guardians would be performing the duty of owner and occupier at the expense of the Union, which he considered was a power that ought not to be exercised at the cost of the whole area of the Union, thus allowing a landlord to escape from the expense of putting his property in a proper sanitary condition. This was a departure from the principle of all previous legislation on the subject. He regretted that a Bill of so much importance was being hurried through Parliament in the manner it was in the last hours of the Session, and by so scantily attended a House. It would be much better that the subject should stand over altogether for the next Parliament.

Sir SYDNEY WATERLOW said, he thought those who took an interest in the question ought to be very grateful to the Government for having brought forward the Bill at this period, and attempting to do something to give effect to the valuable recommendations of the Royal Commission. Thinking that, he was of opinion that the sooner they got into Committee the better. He did not entirely approve of the provisions of the Bill; but he hoped that the Government would adopt Amendments which would have the effect of making the Bill a working and not a mere fancy measure. It seemed to him that there were two main principles in the Bill—one contained in Clause 3 and the other in Clause 13. With regard to Clause 3, he should like to know whether it was to be worked on the lines of the Artizans' Dwellings Act? When the Metropolitan Board of Works bought the sites of the prisons, were they to be compelled to sell them ear-marked and set aside for working class dwellings? Whenever Corporations built they always built at an enormous expense, and to compel the Board to build would be putting them into a difficult position, for either their tenants would practically be the recipients of alms, or they would be charged the full maket value of the rents, and then they would receive no benefit. With respect to Clause 13, he thought that, subject to certain modifications to which he hoped Her Majesty's Government would not object, it might be made most valuable and beneficial.

Mr. HOPWOOD said, that the Bill had been brought in hurriedly, and by agreement, he believed, between the two Front Benches. He very much feared, however, that in the race for popularity the two Front Benches were disposed to sacrifice every economic principle in their desire to catch votes. It seemed to him that the Royal Commission, in presenting the Report they did, had been actuated by red-hot benevolent motives, and had not been so deliberate in their action as they might have been. He really thought it was too late in the Session to attempt to pass a Bill of this kind. It was next to impossible to transform every squalid dwelling into a comfortable one, and it was unwise to create expectations that could not be fulfilled. The failure of the existing legislation on this subject ought to teach them that. An immense amount of misery had been produced by the Artizans' Dwellings Acts. People had been cleared out of the houses without any place being provided for them; and he believed that similar results would follow from this well-meant legislation. When they set about benevolent legislation they might do the opposite of what was intended, and pass ill-conceived measures for the purpose of gaining popularity. In the administration of a really good Bill the municipal principle ought to prevail; but, on the present occasion, this appeared to be nearly altogether ignored. It was proposed that the Local Government Board or the Home Office should have the power of calling upon Local Authorities to pass bye-laws for the purpose of putting the Act into execution. But where were the people affected by these bye-laws to go during the demolition of their homes? Then many of the people who were to be called on to set in motion the machinery created by the Bill were themselves but very little better off than those for whom they were to be ordered to find dwellings. How could they compel ratepayers of that class to find money for the purposes of the measure? The 3rd clause provided that the prices of the prison sites at Coldbath Fields and Millbank should not be less than the sum paid by Her Majesty for them. But the difference between that and the market value now must be enormous. It would amount to a great State grant for Metropolitan improvement only. Then there was another question in relation to the Settled Land Act. It appeared to be assumed that Parliament, by passing this Bill, might give a trustee power to spend the trust funds so as to gratify his own benevolence. No trustee, however, would do so without the sanction of the Court. It was opposed to the very conception of a trust; but that was the way this Bill proceeded. The Bill ought to have been referred to a Select Committee, instead of being forced through the House; and if it had been referred to such a Committee all those difficult points might be properly discussed.

Mr. BUCHANAN wished to say a few words on the subject of the application of the Bill to Scotland. The provisions of the Bill, as he understood, were taken from the Report of the Royal Commission with regard to England, and he believed most of them were contained in the Report with regard to Ireland; but the Home Secretary knew very well that the separate Report with regard to Scotland did not contain any of those provisions. Therefore, it should be borne in mind, by whatever Government was in power after the General Election, that in no sense had the Report of the Commission with regard to Scotland been carried out by simply extending the Bill to that country. About 10 days ago the Home Secretary, in reply to a Question by an Irish Member, stated that, in the opinion of the Government, the Bill ought to apply to Ireland and Scotland; but from that time up to yesterday they had heard nothing more about the matter. It was only this morning that they ascertained what part of the Bill the Home Secretary intended should be applied to Scotland. There were only five Scottish Members now in the House, and those who could speak with authority on these questions were unfortunately absent; therefore they were under very great difficulties in carrying out the intention of the Government to apply a portion of the Bill to Scotland. He understood it was the intention of the Home Secretary to apply Clauses 4, 5, 6, and 7 of the Bill to Scotland. He thought these were distinct improvements, and he should be sorry to see the Bill pass without these clauses being applied to Scotland. With regard to Clauses 1 and 2, he was in some doubt whether they could be made applicable to Scotland or not; but if the opinion of the House was that they were good provisions to be inserted in the Bill, then he thought it would be better if they were also applied to Scotland. He understood, however, there would be considerable difficulty in doing so.

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. Assheton Cross), interrupting, stated that since he had put the Amendments down on the Paper last night they had been carefully looked over by the Government draftsmen and the Lord Advocate, and he had put down a clause in place of Clause 17, which would simplify matters.

Mr. BUCHANAN said, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would take care—for on the Government the exclusive responsibility would rest—that any further Amendments he might propose would be effectual to carry out the provisions of the Act in regard to Scotland, so that the Act might not be a dead letter, but a reality.

Mr. ALBERT GREY said, he must congratulate the Party opposite at having, at any rate in the last few days of an expiring Parliament with the November Elections in their minds, one stalwart and stout Member who was not afraid to criticize, denounce, and even divide against the Socialistic proposals of a so-called Conservative Government. The debate on this Bill had illustrated, in the most convincing manner, the great danger and mischief that might ensue in rushing such a measure through the House without proper consideration; because it contained proposals of great magnitude, embracing principles of enormous scope, and provisions which he would undertake to say had not been mastered and understood by any hon. Member who was not a Member of the Royal Commission. If the Bill had only been brought forward in the beginning of the Session, and the different stages had come on at proper intervals, so that the country might have given its mind to the proposals, it would have issued from the Committee of the House in a very different form and shape from that in which it was destined to pass. They had not had that valuable corrective in the shape of the criticisms of the daily Press. He regretted that the Government had asked the House to pass the Bill without more consideration; and he quite agreed with his hon. Friend opposite that if it could only be postponed to the next Parliament they would probably have a far better Bill, and one far more useful, and giving more permanent advantages to the country, than that which they were now about to pass. If his hon. Friend the Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell) divided the House he should vote with him, as a protest against this hasty and mischievous procedure. He quite admitted that there were many clauses in the Bill which would be of great value; and he fully sympathized with the objects which it had in view. But he would point out that the 3rd clause of the Bill, which by the Commissioners of Sewers of the City of London."

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. JESSE COLLINGS said Subsection 4 of the clause spoke about the Labouring Classes Lodging Houses Acts, 1851 to 1867, being adopted by the Metropolitan Board of Works and Sanitary Authorities. In what way was the power of taking land compulsorily created? As far as he could see, it was provided that no land should be taken except by agreement.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, the question would be dealt with later on.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

On Motion of The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) the following Amendments made:—Page 2, line 41, after "authority," insert "or Commissioners;" page 3, line 1, after "subject," insert "in the case of a rural sanitary authority;" and in line 6, after "1875," insert "or under the Acts conferring powers on such Commissioners of Sewers."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) proposed to add, after the word "respectively," in page 3, line 6—

"(*b.*) All expenses incurred by such board or authority in the execution of the said Acts shall be defrayed—

(i.) in the case of the Metropolitan Board of Works, out of the Dwelling House Improvement Fund, under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875;

(ii.) in the case of an urban sanitary authority, as part of the general expenses of their execution of the Public Health Act, 1875; and

(iii.) in the case of a rural sanitary authority, as special expenses incurred in the execution of the Public Health Act, 1875, and, save where the burden of such expenses is by order of the Local Government Board to be borne by one contributory place only, shall be deemed to be incurred for the common benefit of all the contributory places liable to bear such expenses: Provided that if on the application of the rural sanitary authority it is so declared at the time of the publication of the certificate by the Local Government Board, then the said expenses of the rural sanitary authority shall be defrayed as general expenses of the said authority in the execution of the Public Health Act, 1875, and if such expenses are not to be borne by the whole of the district, shall be charged to the contributory places which are to bear the same as an addition to the general expenses otherwise chargeable thereto;

(iv.) in the case of the City of London, out of the Dwelling House Improvement Fund under the Artizans and Labourers Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875;

"(*c.*) all receipts under the said Acts shall be paid to the fund out of which such expenses are payable, and the accounts of such receipts and expenses shall be audited in like manner and with the like incidents and consequences respectively as the accounts of the general or special expenses above-mentioned; but separate accounts shall be kept of the receipts and expenditure for the purposes of the said Acts;

"(*d.*) such Board and Commissioners may borrow for the purpose of the execution of the said Acts, in like manner and subject to the like conditions as they may borrow for the purposes of the Artizans and Labourers Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875, and every such authority may borrow for the purpose of the execution of the said Acts, in like manner and subject to the like conditions as for the purpose of defraying the above-mentioned general or special expenses;

"(*e.*) in the application of the said Acts to the City of London, 'district' shall mean the City of London, and 'board' the Commissioners of Sewers of that city; and in the application of the said Acts to the Metropolis, 'district' shall mean the Metropolis exclusive of the City of London, and 'Board' the Metropolitan Board of Works; and in the application of the said Acts to a rural sanitary district, 'district' shall mean the said district, and 'board' the rural sanitary authority."

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

MR. PELL asked what was the meaning of the words—

"Such Board and every such authority may borrow for the purpose of the execution of the said Acts, in like manner, and subject to the like conditions, as for the purpose of defraying the above-mentioned general or special expenses."

Was it intended that a Local Authority might, under this Act, or the Lodging Houses Acts, borrow money for general necessities?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, the terms were technical; there were what were known as general expenses and special expenses.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

MR. TOMLINSON proposed to add to the last Amendment—

"In any case where an urban sanitary authority is empowered by a local Act or Acts to borrow money and to levy a rate or rates throughout the whole of their district for purposes similar to those or to some of those for which a general district rate is leviable, it shall be lawful for such sanitary authority to defray the expenses incurred in the execution of the said Acts by means of money to be borrowed, and a rate or rates to be levied, under such local Act or Acts."

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) assented to the Amendment.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Definition of purposes of Labouring Classes Lodging Houses Acts) *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (Provision respecting sites of certain metropolitan prisons).

MR. J. R. HOLLOND regretted that the Amendment he had to move to this clause had not found its way in proper form to the Paper. What he desired to move was to leave out all the words after "Pentonville, Penitentiary," in line 30, to "and," in line 32. The next Amendment of his was to leave out all the words after "prison," in line 33, and insert—

"No sale of the said sites shall take place except with the authority of Parliament."

If those alterations were made the clause would read—

"In the event of the removal from their present sites of Millbank Penitentiary or Pentonville Penitentiary, and in the event of the removal from its present site of Coldbath Fields Prison, no sale of the said sites shall take place except with the authority of Parliament."

His object in moving those Amendments was, on the one hand, that Parliament should retain control over the sites, so that they should not be disposed of without full discussion in the House, and that, on the other hand, they should not at that late period of the Session settle precisely in what manner those sites were to be disposed of. The difficulty of settling how to dispose of those sites was shown by the Amendments which stood on the Paper. There were various Amendments to the clause; some dealt with the erection of workmen's dwellings, some with the making of open spaces, some with the erection of schools upon the sites. If those Amendments were carried, would it, or would it not, be possible for the Metropolitan Board of Works to build a number of shops on the sites? If not, the ratepayers of London might be subjected to considerable loss.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, the primary object was the accommodation of the working classes. Everything that was auxiliary to that object would be allowed.

MR. J. R. HOLLOND said, that further explanation was certainly required. They were dealing with about 40 acres of land, and they were asked to settle the destination of the sites in a somewhat hurried manner at the end of a Session, and it seemed to him without considering sufficiently whether it was wise, from a prison point of view, that the prisons should be removed. Sir Edmund Du Cane's evidence before the Committee went to show that, although the site of Millbank Penitentiary only cost £1,200, there had been spent on buildings something like £600,000. The Committee ought to know whether, in case the site was disposed of as proposed, the Government were to be recouped in any way for the money they had spent. He sympathized with those who strongly objected on principle to the disposal of those sites in this way. It seemed to him that they might come to some sort of agreement whereby Parliament should retain control of the sites, and leave the settlement of the precise destination of the sites to another Session. It would be extremely easy to do that; it could be done by introducing next year a Bill dealing specially with those sites. The only thing that would happen would be that the destination of the sites would be left over for further, and he believed riper, determination.

Amendment proposed,

In page 4, line 30, to leave out all the words after "Pentonville, Penitentiary," to "and," in line 32.—(*Mr. Hollond.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. ALBERT GREY said, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman (Sir R. Assheton Cross) would consider this Amendment favourably, because it seemed to him (Mr. A. Grey) a very fair compromise between the promoters of the Bill and those who objected to the 3rd clause on principle. The Amendment really postponed to another Parliament the settlement of the destination of the prison sites, which it was hoped would be cleared and devoted to some object which would bring about an amelioration in the condition of the working classes. There were many reasons why the clause should not be adopted. [Mr. Jesse Collings: No!] The hon. Member for Ipswich said "No!" He could well understand why the hon. Gentleman supported the clause. He repeated that there were many reasons why they should reject the clause. If they adopted the clause as it now stood, they would be adopting a clause based upon a principle absolutely new to legislation, and they would give an opportunity to the hon. Gentleman the Member for Ipswich (Mr. Jesse Collings) and his Friends to conduct an agitation which would not be very palatable to Gentlemen sitting on the Front Ministerial Bench. It seemed to him (Mr. A. Grey) that they had no right at the fag-end of a Session, when four-fifths of the Members were away, to invite the House of Commons to legislate in a way which he very much doubted it would legislate if there was a full House. But there was another reason why he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman (Sir R. Assheton Cross) to accept this Amendment. There were many Amendments to follow. Every one of those Amendments they meant to fight and to divide upon. If the right hon. Gentleman was going to insist upon this proposal simply because it had come down from the House of Lords — ["The Royal Commission."] The Royal Commission! Members of the Royal Commission who had spoken upon the Bill had spoken most strongly against this proposal. The hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Lyulph Stanley), who was a Member of the Commission, made a most eloquent speech against this proposal; and he (Mr. A. Grey) believed that other Members of the Royal Commission who were in the House very much agreed with what the hon. Gentleman said. They would not quarrel, however, as to the source from which the proposal came. All he wished to point out to the right hon. Gentleman was that, unless he could see his way to accept this very reasonable Amendment, he (Mr. A. Grey) and others meant to fight the clause inch by inch and line by line. They meant to divide upon every Amendment, and to make it as difficult as possible for the right hon. Gentleman to carry a clause containing a principle to which they objected so much. He had thought it right to make those remarks, though he did not wish it to be understood he used them in any menacing spirit. He hoped the right hon. Gentleman would give a favourable consideration to his remarks, and, if possible, promote the speedy passing of the Bill through the House by accepting the Amendment.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) thought the hon. Gentleman (Mr. A. Grey) had just given them full warning of obstruction to the clause. The clause, as now proposed, was recommended by the vast majority of the Members of the Royal Commission; it had come down from the House of Lords, and he (Sir R. Assheton Cross) desired to take the sense of the Committee upon it. He must remind hon. Gentlemen who proposed that the matter should stand over that what the promoters of the Bill wanted to do was to afford some speedy relief. If hon. Gentlemen would examine the Bill they would find that the advance of the money was confined to a certain date. The prisons in question were being emptied, and there was no reason why the land should remain idle any longer than could be helped. It was proposed not merely that the sites themselves should be devoted to working men's dwellings, but that it should be in the power of the Metropolitan Board of Works to exchange them for others. If hon. Members knew what was going on in London they would readily admit that time was really the essence of the matter. He was quite willing to abide by the decision of the Committee, and he hoped that decision would be arrived at without delay.

Mr. HOPWOOD asked if anyone doubted that if the House were full there would be an instructive and animated discussion upon this clause, with possibly a result disastrous to it? Did the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary remember the debates which took place annually in regard to the contributions made out of the public funds for the special advantage of the community of London? Every item of increase with regard to the Parks and the building of additional Offices—in fact, every attempt to spend money for the special benefit of the people of London—always received the very strongest opposition in the House. He had not a doubt that a clause like this would, if introduced at another period of the Session, either be rejected *in toto* or referred to a Select Committee.

MR. PICTON said, it was evident that this clause was opposed to the convictions of a considerable number of the Members of the House. A good deal been said that evening about Socialism being involved in this clause. He did not object to Socialism of a proper kind, for he thought there was such a thing as equitable Socialism. But this clause did not represent Socialism at all; it represented patronage, and patronage of a sort which tended to provide for the moderately well-off at the expense of the extremely destitute. That he believed to be the real tendency of the clause, and he desired to say why he thought so. If the clause was carried out, and the land was sold for less than its market value, a number of houses could be provided at less rent than that paid for houses in many parts of London. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) interpolated a remark while the hon. Member for the Tower Hamlets (Mr. Bryce) was speaking that evening, to the effect that the houses were not to be let below their market value. He understood the right hon. Gentleman to mean by that that the houses would not be let for less than would pay a fair percentage upon the outlay. [Mr. A. J. BALFOUR: No!] He was sorry if he misunderstood the right hon. Gentleman. He would continue his remarks, and perhaps, if he was wrong, the right hon. Gentleman would correct him. He understood the right hon. Gentleman to say that the houses would not be let at a less rental, considering that the land would be bought at a less price than it could be got for in the open market. At any rate, it stood to reason that if the land was bought for less than it could be bought for in the open market the houses could be let at less than their full and proper value. The number of houses was nothing; the principle was everything; but, supposing there were 500 houses to be let at a lower rent than that at which houses could be ordinarily secured, manifestly it would be a great advantage to get hold of one of the houses or tenements. There must be a considerable competition for them. On what principle were they to be allotted? Would it be first come first served? He doubted it. The general rule in such cases was to make a selection. There would be a certain number of people who had good recommendations, who were sober, diligent, and thrifty, and they would be considered suitable tenants for such advantageous houses. Then here was a case of patronage at once. It was a valuable gift to a man to get into a tenement of this kind. At whose expense was this patronage to be exercised? The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) had spoken about the intervention of the State, and of the windfalls of the State, which the State might, he said, very reasonably make over to a certain number of tenants. But what was the State? The State was not the Government, the State was certainly the whole of the inhabitants of this country; and, directly or indirectly, all men—even children were taxpayers, for some of them got less food than they otherwise would owing to the direct or indirect pressure of taxation—every man, woman, and child—had to contribute towards the expenses of the State. When, therefore, they spoke of the State sacrificing a windfall they spoke of the whole of the inhabitants of the country sacrificing a windfall; they spoke of the destitute and suffering sacrificing so much property which, directly or indirectly, might be used for their benefit. Therefore, he contended that this patronage was exercised at the expense of those who were worse off than the people who would be put into those houses. He put it forth as a general principle that the burden of taxation and of all public expenses tended to gravitate to the very lowest depths, and he believed there would be a gravitation of such a kind in this case. If, at the expense of the rates or of taxation, they gave a certain number of people accommodation for a price at which they could not obtain it in the open market, they would do it at the expense of someone. If there was a loss of money someone must bear it; and he thought, when they considered the operation of rates and taxes, they would find that just outside that area of well-constructed and healthy dwellings, dwellings that were let at a low rent to thrifty and respectable working people, there were destitute and suffering people who had to contribute through the extra rates and taxation for the better condition of those who were better able to provide for themselves than they were. He thought that that was the operation of the clause, and he, therefore, must earnestly contend against it. He appealed to Her Majesty's Government to consider the point seriously. They must have felt that there were deep convictions on this subject; they must see that many hon. Members regarded the clause as an exceedingly dangerous one. It had been a very painful thing for some of them to have to vote against a particular stage of the Bill; although they were anxious that better dwellings should be secured for the working classes, they had had to vote against a stage of the Bill because of this vicious principle embodied in it.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, that time was valuable, yet time ought not to count when there was an important principle involved. He would make a suggestion to see whether they could not come to a fair and equitable arrangement. The great difficulty seemed to arise from the fact that a price was put in the Bill; and, therefore, he would suggest that the clause should stop at line 36, leaving out—

"At such price, to be fixed by agreement or arbitration, as will enable the Board to appropriate the sites or parts so conveyed for the purposes of the Labouring Classes Lodging Houses Acts, 1851 to 1867, as amended by this Act: Provided that the price shall not be less than the price paid for the land when it was purchased on behalf of Her Majesty or of the county of Middlesex respectively,"

and then, in order to show what really was the meaning of the clause, adopt the Amendment which stood in his name—

"For the purpose of the erection thereon by the Board or other parties, for the use of the working classes, buildings disposed in streets, squares, or otherwise, with or without open spaces, with power for such Board, as to all or any part of such sites, to lease the same to other persons, to be used for the purposes aforesaid, or to exchange the same for other land to be applied for like purposes, or to convert by sale the same into money, to be invested in land to be applied for like purposes, so that the land taken by exchange or sale be situate within the Metropolis."

They would thus get rid of the difficulty of putting the price in the Bill. He only threw that out as a suggestion; if it was not accepted, he was quite prepared to stand by the Bill as it stood, and, if necessary, to go on until they passed it.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: Does the right hon. Gentleman mean by that that it shall not be lawful for the Treasury to sell the land at less than its market value?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, the clause would then run in this way—

"In the event of the removal from their present sites of Millbank Penitentiary, or Pentonville Penitentiary, it shall be lawful for Her Majesty, on the recommendation of the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury, and in the event of the removal from its present site of Coldbath Fields Prison, it shall be lawful for the justices of the peace for the county of Middlesex, if the justices think fit so to do, to sell and convey those respective sites or any part or parts thereof to the Metropolitan Board of Works, for the purpose of the erection thereon by the Board or other parties for the use of the working classes," and so on.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, it did not appear to him that the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman (Sir R. Assheton Cross) met in any way the opposition that was raised to this clause; and he wished in the most serious manner possible to remind Her Majesty's Government of the distinct pledge that was given to the House some weeks ago by the Leader of the House, to the effect that no contentious Business should be proceeded with during the remainder of the Session. He wished to ask Her Majesty's Government whether they considered this contentious Business or not? If they were to accept the suggestion of the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary it would have this consequence—that he would deal with this matter probably at one bite; and those who intended to make this contentious matter, and very contentious matter, would be easily disposed of. That would be very disadvantageous, and would not lead to the enforcement of the pledge of Her Majesty's Government, a pledge which was being distinctly violated on this occasion.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): I protest against such words, and I hope the hon. Gentleman will withdraw them.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, he would say that the pledge of Her Majesty's Government had not been observed, and to that he must strictly adhere; but he wanted to say something more with regard to this proposal. This was a proposal giving a distinct advantage to London and to the ratepayers of London. [Mr. Jesse Collings: No; London has created it.] The hon. Member for Ipswich said that London had created it; but he (Mr. Arnold) did not see that at all. Manchester and Liverpool and other places had contributed directly to the increase of value of these prison sites; and he stood there as a Representative of one of those constituencies, in order to claim on behalf of his constituents their share of that increment of value. How was it to be given to them? Was it to be given to them through prison sites or in some other direction? At all events, he distinctly objected, and he should be very glad to support his hon. Friend the Member for South Northumberland (Mr. A. Grey) in objecting, as long as he pleased, to the confiscation by Her Majesty's Government of his constituents' share of the increment of value. There was nothing in the present rates that were levied on the people of London which entitled them to that share. The people of many of the manufacturing towns were paying higher rates than those paid by the people of London. He had previously called attention to the peculiar advantages possessed by the working classes of London in regard to their moving from one part of the Metropolis to another. Now, the right hon. Gentleman had spoken with all the authority belonging to a Member of the Royal Commission as to what happened on that Commission. The right hon. Gentleman knew better than he did what happened on that Commission; but he believed that the right hon. Gentleman's statement, that the proposal to give this land at cost price was carried by a vast majority of the Members of the Commission, was one that was not strictly correct. At all events, this was the fact—that in the Report of the Royal Commission the only arguments in favour of this proposal were those of the noble Marquess the Prime Minister (the Marquess of Salisbury). There was not an argument of any sort or kind in the general Report of the Commission which sustained the proposition — the extraordinary and reckless proposition—which was now before the Committee. He did hope that the interest of other places besides London would be regarded by hon. Members that night. It was only recently that he divided the Committee in respect of the subsidies given to London for their Parks and various institutions. People who lived outside London were tired of these subventions which were given to the Metropolis, and which were not defended by the late Government. Her Majesty's late Government had given them up, and he said that the time had arrived when this custom of giving advantage to London ought not to be continued. He had often before protested against it; he did so again on that occasion, and he called on Her Majesty's Government not to go forward with this contentious Bill.

Mr. BRYCE said, he thought that the proposal of the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department was one which might be fairly accepted by his hon. Friend; but, for his own part, he wished to hear more about that proposal, which he thought was surrounded by a certain amount of obscurity. The right hon. Gentleman knew that if the land were sold under the Acts which bore his name, and in order that workmen's dwellings should be erected on it, the land could not be sold at its full value. Therefore, he said that the words suggested by the right hon. Gentleman—"Sell for the purpose of erection, &c."—would have the same effect, and would operate with the arbitrator in determining what the price should be. He and his hon. Friends thought that a fair market price ought to be given; and if the right hon. Gentleman would consent to the insertion of words which would state that a fair market price should be given for the land, and say, at the same time, that he would consent to that portion of the Amendment which provided that the matter should afterwards come before Parliament for its decision and confirmation, he thought they might accept the clause. He thought the Committee would in that way provide for future difficulties that might arise from the adoption of a proposal which carried on the face of it a certain amount of obscurity, and with regard to whose results they knew nothing.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS said, he could not follow his hon. Friend the Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) in the views he had expressed on this proposal of Her Majesty's Government. His hon. Friend was opposed to subventions to the Metropolis which came out of the Consolidated Fund; but he would point out that this proposal came under a different category. With the permission of the Committee he would prove that point. Who was it that had made the increased value of sites in the Metropolis; was it Salford or Manchester? [Mr. Arthur Arnold: Yes; both.] But suppose those sites cost £10,000, and were now worth £30,000, what, he asked, had produced the increase of the value of the land? Why, the enterprize, the trade, and increased population of London. Well, then, what was proposed here was to give that increment of value by certain means back to the people of London. He was prepared to go so far as to say that it was not, perhaps, the best way of doing it; but he contended that, on the grounds he had shown, the proposal of Her Majesty's Government was altogether removed from the category of mere subventions. He should vote for the clause because he wanted to extend the principle; he wanted to say to the great landowners of Westminster—"You gave £10,000 for the property that is now worth ten times the amount; that increase of value has been created by the trade and population of London; and, therefore, we believe you should in some way contribute to the well-being of those who brought about that result." He could quote the Marquess of Salisbury in this matter. The noble Marquess said before the Commission on the subject of housing the working classes, on whose recommendation this proposal was based, that—

> "It more closely resembled a provision for compensation than the offer of a gift;"

and, therefore, he (Mr. Jesse Collings) entreated his Radical Friends especially to vote with both hands for this clause. He had voted against subventions for keeping up Parks for London; but that was quite another matter. They were dealing now with an increased value created by the people of London, which it was proposed to give back to them—a process which he said they must continue to apply to other land that had increased in value through the same agency, and with respect to which, either by taxation or some plan a little more convenient than the present, they hoped to arrive at the same end. This was altogether a different matter from a subvention, even supposing that Salford and Manchester had anything to do with creating this increment of value. For these reasons he should vote for the clause, defending it altogether from the subvention theory. He would ask his hon. Friend the Member for South Northumberland (Mr. A. Grey) whether, under these circumstances, he was consistent in obstructing the Bill? His hon. Friend objected to the word "obstruction;" then he would say "opposing the Bill in a very lively manner." Finally, he again appealed to his hon. Friends to support the clause.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, he would make another suggestion which he hoped would enable the Committee to come to an agreement on the clause. He proposed to insert at the end words which would make the clause run thus—

> "The price of such site shall be a fair market price fixed by agreement or arbitration."

Mr. PELL said, if the right hon. Gentleman intended to move that as an Amendment, he would point out that its effect would be to make the Metropolitan Board of Works hold the land until they realized a very much higher price than they gave for it—not its marketable value. Perhaps the right hon. Gentleman would be good enough to say if he was correct in that view of the case.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, that he proposed to introduce an Amendment which would guard against the contingency suggested by his hon. Friend. He hoped the hon. Member would consent to withdraw the Amendment now before the Committee.

Mr. HORACE DAVEY said, the Amendment suggested by the right hon. Gentleman the Secretary of State for the Home Department was not satisfactory to himself, nor did he think it would be to some of his hon. Friends. This was one of those clauses which were very often introduced in that House, which might mean one thing to one side and another thing to the other. What would be the effect given to this clause in the Law Courts of the country? In the first place, he should like to know whether the clause was really necessary or not? If not, its effect would be merely to give a permissive power enabling the Treasury and the Justices of Middlesex to sell to the Metropolitan Board of Works their prisons for a particular purpose; but, of course, the purpose for which a person bought property had nothing to do with the vendor. He should like to know whether, under the existing law, the Justices of the county of Middlesex or the Treasury, when these sites ceased to be required for prison purposes, were not entitled, and had not the power to sell them, either to the Metropolitan Board of Works or anyone else in the Kingdom at the market price. The second criticism he wished to make on the clause was this—and here he might say that he entirely agreed with the hon. Member for South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell)—that it expressly proposed to convert the Metropolitan Board of Works into builders. He objected to the rates paid by the people of London being employed in speculative building. Either it was to be done at a profit without a fair return for the money or it was not. If at a profit, then he objected to the Metropolitan Board of Works making the people of London participators in these speculative transactions; if it was to be done at a loss, as he supposed was the real intention, then he objected to the ratepayers of the Metropolis being burdened with the obligation, or its being placed in the power of the Metropolitan Board of Works to impose that obligation of providing dwellings for the working classes at the expense of the rates. He hoped the Government would appreciate the argument of his hon. Friend the Member for Ipswich (Mr. Jesse Collings), who was extremely candid as to the view which he took of this clause, and as to the ground on which he and his Radical Friends meant to vote for it. He hoped Her Majesty's Government would appreciate the contention that they could not deal with State property or public property in this manner—by giving it away or by selling it at less than the real value for the purpose of benefiting certain classes of the community, without setting an example and creating a precedent for similar dealing with the unearned increment, or an increment added to the estates of private persons by the increasing wealth of the Metropolis. He felt strongly on this subject; and although he was not altogether in accord with the views of the hon. Member for Ipswich with regard to it, he did hope the Government would appreciate what it was they were really doing by this clause. The next criticism he desired to make on the clause was this—the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary proposed to add words to provide that the price given for the sites should be the fair market price. Yes: a fair market price, but on what conditions? If the land was to be sold to the Metropolitan Board of Works for a particular purpose it was idle and illusory to say that the price was to be the fair market price, because on the conditions laid down in the Bill it was impossible to get a fair market price for it. As he had said, he objected strongly to the clause, not only on behalf of the ratepayers of the Metropolis, but on behalf of the public generally. He regarded those sites as part of the public property of the country, and he said that the Government had no right to make a present to the people of London—for it really was a present—of that property, any more than they had the right to make to the people a present of public property in other parts of the Kingdom. He remembered that when it was a question of selling the foreshore at Southport they were told by the Government then in power that it was the duty of the Government to safeguard public property, and to take care if it was sold that it was sold at the highest price that could be obtained for it. Well, then, he said the same principle should be applied to London as to the other parts of the country. For those reasons he objected to the clause as it stood, and he also objected to it in the form in which it was proposed to be amended by the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary, because he believed it would have the effect of achieving the same end in a different way; and, moreover, it had the additional inconvenience about it—he should say this additional vice—that the right hon. Gentleman's proposed addition to the clause was capable of being interpreted in two different ways. It was just one of those clauses which, he was sorry to say, were often put into Bills in Committee of that House by way of compromise, when one party meant one thing and the other meant another, and which were among the most fertile sources of litigation. If the right hon. Gentleman would allow him to do so, he would like to ask the President of the Local Government Board if he had forgotten that most impressive speech which he made at an earlier period of this Parliament, when he complained that the spirit of economy had deserted those Benches? But he did not want to make this a personal argument; he did not think that the present Government were to be blamed for this class of legislation, which had become far too common before they took Office, and his object in making these observations on the clause was by way of protest against legislation of the kind.

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) said, he did not intend to continue a discussion upon an abstract doctrine; but he must say a word or two with regard to what had fallen from the hon. Member for Ipswich (Mr. Jesse Collings) and the hon. and learned Member for Christchurch (Mr. Horace Davey). The Government had been taunted with having introduced in this clause a provision for the appropriation of what one school of economists called the unearned increment; but he wished to say that whatever faults might be imputed against the clause, that fault it did not possess. The object of the clause was to enable the State to make a certain use of its own property. Those who desired to see the appropriation of unearned increment wished the State to make use of somebody else's property. The two methods of procedure were divided by the whole difference which separated charity from spoliation.

SIR SYDNEY WATERLOW said, he would not trouble the Committee with any remarks on the unearned increment farther than to say that he presumed that the unearned increment in the case of these prison sites belonged to the State; and he believed that the State might appropriate that increment for the benefit of the classes which they thought ought to have it, if in so doing they did the best for the community at large. He thought they would all agree to the proposition that the better the working classes were housed, the better it would be for the nation as a whole. But he wished to call attention to the practical working of the clause. They had heard a great deal about the unearned increment. He wished to remark that the moment it was known that the sites were to be utilized for the purpose of the Bill, the market value of the land would be brought down by one-fourth or one-third. He did not wish to say anything about that. If it was the intention to do away with the prisons, he did not think they could do better with the sites on which they stood than erect upon them dwellings for the working classes with good wide spaces between them. But he objected when the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary and the right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board said that the dwellings, when erected, were to make a fair return. ["Hear, hear!"] Well, he would pass from that point. If the persons to be benefited were to pay a fair market price for the dwellings, surely the vendors of the land ought to sell it for a fair market price, because it was to be utilized for a particular purpose, and that very fact would bring the price down. Again, he objected to the proposal that the land should be dealt with by agreement or arbitration. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman (Sir R. Assheton Cross), who would, perhaps, remember that evidence was given by the surveyor to the Peabody Trustees—namely, that the ground let to the Trustees was let at 50 per cent less than it would have been worth under ordinary circumstances. If the right hon. Gentleman would put into this clause words that would leave the land open to public competition, so that the dealing might be fair, he should not object to it; but if it was to be left to be settled by agreement or arbitration, he was bound to say that he could not approve of that course at all; because, in that case, the people intended to be benefited would get no benefit to the same extent; whereas, if the matter were left to public competition, no one could find fault with the price realized. Supposing that the Metropolitan Board of Works bought in the manner contemplated in the Bill supposing it was at a very low price, they would have to spend money in pulling down and road making before they could let the premises; and he ventured to say that the highest price got for the dwellings would not do more than pay for the money laid out in this way. Then with regard to the argument that the Metropolitan Board of Works were to become speculative builders; no one knew better than the right hon. Gentleman that the Metropolitan Board of Works were very indisposed to become builders, and have the responsibility of letting the buildings erected; he knew also that the members of the Board were gentlemen of great influence, who knew what sort of influence would be brought to bear upon them. He said there was no safety in the clause, unless the Government proceeded by way of public competition, which would prevent any fault being found with what was done, and would enable the working classes to get what they wanted at a fair price. The time had gone by when they could shut their eyes to the fact that they must continue to provide dwellings for the working classes. Those classes were increasing year by year; and the Committee should remember that one of the witnesses examined before the Royal Commission had stated that although a great deal had been done in that direction there was still much overcrowding. In suggesting the addition of words which would leave the price to be paid to public competition, he felt sure that the right hon. Gentleman would give him credit for speaking in the public interest; and he trusted that his suggestion would be adopted, because then they would get rid of the idea that the fair market price would not be paid.

MR. A. R. D. ELLIOT said, that the further they went with this discussion the more clearly it must appear to those who watched their proceedings that the best thing the Government could do would be to withdraw the clause altogether. That, he thought, was the ground which ought to be taken up by hon. Gentlemen on those Benches. He must say that the right hon. Gentleman had dealt rather easily with the argument put forward in the course of the discussion by his hon. Friend the Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold), who said there had been an undertaking on the part of Her Majesty's Government not to proceed with any contentious Business. If these matters were not contentious he was at a loss to understand how the right hon. Gentleman would characterize the recent proceedings. He would like to call attention to a matter in which many Members from Scotland were interested—that was to say, the Bill dealing with the Scotch Universities. That Bill had been given up altogether because there was some opposition to one or two of its clauses, and the Government, in consequence, said it was clearly a contentious matter. He asked the right hon. Gentleman to apply in one case the rule he had applied in the other; he asked him to carry out the pledge that no contentious Business should be taken; and he thought that what had taken place that evening was quite enough to prove that this Bill was of a highly contentious character. Several hon. Members who were interested in this question had left town. Of course, they could not be blamed for going away at that time of the Session; if they were away it could not be helped, and it was absurd to expect that the Committee could have any fair and open discussion on matters of this kind on the 11th of August. If the right hon. Gentleman would amend the clause by putting in words to the effect that the land should be sold for the best price obtainable in the open market, the clause might be agreed to; but he thought it was useless to go on with it otherwise. He thought that the hon. Gentleman beside him was a little hard upon hon. Members on those Benches in saying that the hon. Member for South Northumberland (Mr. A. Grey) was obstructing the clause. Why, any hon. Member would know who had watched their proceedings during the last three weeks that anything like obstruction was not only foreign to their intentions, but absolutely repugnant to their general notions of procedure. They had taken the Bill fairly, clause by clause; and he would like to ask right hon. Gentlemen opposite whether, if the Treasury Bench had been occupied by Liberals instead of Conservatives, it was probable that the Bill would have the slightest chance of being carried? Right hon. Gentlemen opposite had many advantages over their Predecessors; they had not to deal with obstruction in that House, and they could do what they pleased in "another place." He felt sure that having pointed out to right hon. Gentlemen opposite that their action that night had been almost contradictory of the solemn pledges given, they would agree with him in saying that they ought not to go any further with this contentious Bill.

Mr. BROADHURST said, he must support this clause. He had ventured to criticize some of its features; but he heartily supported it for the reason that it established the very sound doctrine that the increased value of the land in cases of this kind belonged to the people whose industry had made it more valuable, and on that account he and his hon. Friends could not consent for a moment to a modification of the clause in any form whatever. He appealed to the right hon. Gentleman who had charge of the Bill to conform to the recommendation of the Royal Commission by retaining the clause as it stood at present. He thought there might have been a better way out of this difficulty had the suggestion which he had had the honour of making been thoroughly adhered to and carried out. He said that, instead of selling these sites for the purpose of erecting on them dwellings for the working classes, it would be far better if they were at once made over for open spaces for the benefit of all the community. They could not possibly touch a spot in London where 10 or 20 acres of open space could not do an enormous amount of good to the whole of the inhabitants of London, by giving, as it were, large air holes for the circulation of purer atmosphere; and he thought that if steps were taken in that direction a great advantage to the people would result. He did not care for the change which the right hon. Gentleman proposed to make in the clause; on the contrary, he very much feared that it would detract considerably from the value of the intended gift; and if the right hon. Gentleman had a moment to spare he should be exceedingly glad to know the reason for the proposed change. There were one or two distinguished young Members on that side of the House who wished to maintain certain old-fashioned principles which they had adopted owing to their association with hon. Gentlemen on the Ministerial Benches. He sincerely hoped that Members of the Liberal Party would hold fast to their proposals in this matter. He was very glad to see the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House in his place. That right hon. Gentleman had made a speech at Bristol on Saturday night which was in the nature of a very strong attack on the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham (Mr. Chamberlain) for his Socialistic tendencies; and he (Mr. Broadhurst) had been surprised to find on reading his speech that the right hon. Gentleman had not even read the Bill which was coming before the House, as the first Order of the Day on Monday, and which contained Socialism in a purer form than anything he remembered to have been recommended by the right hon. Gentleman the Member for Birmingham. When the right hon. Gentleman the Leader of the House returned and learnt in the House of Commons on Monday afternoon that the Party which he led were the real initiators of this class of legislation he naturally became considerably alarmed, and he (Mr. Broadhurst) had no doubt that it was due to his well-known caution in matters of legislation, that this modification was proposed. He sincerely hoped that the Government would remain firm to its proposal; and he could assure the right hon. Gentleman that in adhering to the clause as it stood in the Bill he would have no firmer supporter, nor any more laborious assistant, in carrying the clause than himself.

Mr. GREGORY said, he understood the object of the Government was to give the Metropolitan Board of Works the right of pre-emption of these lands for certain purposes—that was to say, the erection of workmen's dwellings when the disused prisons now standing upon them were removed—they contemplated that the Board should have this preference over all other purchasers provided they paid a fair market price. If that were the correct view of the intention of the Government, he thought it would be better to deal with the matter on Report.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, after the discussion which had taken place, he thought the Government should agree to postpone this question. He had certainly understood that the Government and the Opposition had agreed that no contentious measure should be taken during the remainder of the Session; but this Bill was of a highly contentious character, and had been understood to be so for some days past. But there was a further objection to proceeding, and it was that they were asked to go forward with this clause in entire ignorance of the real value of the land in question. He had heard that in the opinion of some persons one of the sites of 23 acres was worth £60,000 or £80,000; but that, in the opinion of another person, it was worth from £120,000 to £160,000; but the fact was the Committee knew nothing at all about the value of the land. If the actual value of the land was to be obtained, he said that the question before the Committee would be one of limited importance; but the point they were concerned about was whether they were to get the real value for the land, or that which the State might place upon it, or accept. He had been conversing with a gentleman very competent to speak on this matter, who said he was authorized by the prison authorities to say that the value of the site was of less value than was supposed. If, therefore, the clause, as he recommended that it should be, were postponed, there would be time to find out the value of the land, which, as he had said, might possibly be found to be less than was generally thought. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had offered to the Committee what he called a compromise—that was to say, to adopt the words "at a fair market price;" but it was to be accompanied with conditions which really raised the question in another form. If the sale of the land was to be subject to the condition alluded to, the whole question arose whether the land would be sold at a high or a low price. As he had said, he hoped the right hon. Gentleman would agree to the postponement of the clause; first, because the matter was really contentious; and, secondly, because there was no knowledge or general agreement as to the real value of the land.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he wished to say one or two words on this very important question. He had never disguised from his right hon. Friend that he particularly disliked the clause, which, he thought, was one that might better have been left out of the Bill. He ventured now to appeal to him, seeing that there were many other important provisions in the Bill, to consider whether he might not fairly follow the advice of the right hon. Gentleman who had just sat down, and either to postpone the clause or leave it out of the Bill altogether. He was one of those who thought that they had no right to dispose of public property in this way—at any rate, without knowing what the value of that property was. This was the property more or less of the nation, and he said that, if it was the intention of the Government to make it a present to the people of London, they ought to know exactly what the value of the present was to be. He admitted the difficulty which London had to contend with in respect of dwellings for the working classes; he admitted, as had been pointed out by the hon. Baronet the Member for Gravesend (Sir Sydney Waterlow), that although much had been done, much remained to be done there, to contend with, and, if possible, remove, the condition of over-crowding in which many sections of the working classes lived; but he could not go the length of saying that they ought to sacrifice valuable sites, and so set a precedent which he should have thought the right hon. Gentleman would have considered many times before introducing into the Bill. He felt strongly on this point; but if Her Majesty's Government would accept the Amendment suggested by the hon. Member for Gravesend, he thought that, at any rate, the clause would be greatly improved. But the better course would be, in his opinion, to take time to consider whether the clause should remain in the Bill.

MR. FIRTH said, he had a few short observations to make on this subject; and, in the first place, he would express the hope that Her Majesty's Government would not withdraw the clause. Having some knowledge of the people of London, he had a right to express his opinions on the question before the Committee. He could understand that there were differences of opinion among the people as to the use made of the property in question. It seemed to him that the position was very shortly stated. It was that the Government had, up to the present time, the control of the prisons in London; they now proposed to take the prisons out of London, to take the question of housing the working classes over, and to put it under the control of Parliament. If that were so he thought it ought to be clearly stated in the Bill that the matter was not to be left to the Metropolitan Board of Works, which he said no one acquainted with the character of the workmen of the country would wish to see constituted an authority in the matter. It seemed, however, to him that the Government, having exercised hitherto control over the London prisons, desired in future to exercise control over the dwellings of the working classes. He could not understand why, if the ground were suitable for the purpose of erecting warehouses or other places of business, the people of London should be compelled to pay a greater price for it. He hoped the Government would adhere to the clause, which he said was sound in principle.

Sir GABRIEL GOLDNEY appealed to the Committee to pass the clause as it stood, without stopping a useful Bill to consider the price the land ought to be sold for. This measure was another effort and attempt to raise the moral condition of the people. In the case of the National Gallery and other kindred Institutions, the Committee was aware that large sums were spent out of the Consolidated Fund. Everyone was agreed on the principle of the measure; and he asked whether, for the paltry sum of £100,000, they were prepared to have this site let to the highest bidder, the consequence of which would be that warehouses would be erected on it, and it would be lost to the locality for all purposes of social and moral benefit for ever? The Royal Commission had considered this question very fully in framing their Report as to sites for Workmen's Dwellings, and the principle of the Bill had been decided upon; and now the small thought had arisen in the minds of some hon. Members that they ought to endeavour to get the highest possible price for the land, to increase the Consolidated Fund even at the risk of letting the poor go unhoused. He said that the supporters of a Government which 'had been engaged on this question for two years, and had, during the last three Sessions, been engaged in passing Acts of Parliament with the object of bettering the condition of the working classes, and who had spent millions and millions on education, ought to unite in pushing forward the Bill. But instead of that they came down with questions as to what these prison sites were worth in the locality. The right hon. Gentleman the Member for Reading (Mr. Shaw Lefevre) had given estimates of value, which varied from each other, although one of them appeared to rest more or less upon official judgment; but he (Sir Gabriel Goldney) replied that this was not a question to be adjusted according to the strict principles of State economy; and he contended that the proposal of Her Majesty's Government ought graciously to be accepted by the Committee as the best means of settling a considerable portion of a question which had troubled the people of London for many years.

Mr. CHEETHAM said, he had placed on the Paper an Amendment which was against the principle of subvention in this matter. The hon. and learned Member for Chelsea (Mr. Firth) had contended that the people of London were entitled to this subvention, and he had been supported in that contention by the hon. Baronet the Member for Chippenham (Sir Gabriel Goldney). All he could say was that, if this view was held generally, he was afraid that it afforded very little security for the National Trusts. He understood that the right hon. Gentleman had framed words which would cover the object he intended to secure; and if that point were made perfectly clear he would not think it necessary to move his Amendment. But he was obliged to say that he joined hon. Members on those Benches in their appeal to the right hon. Gentleman to postpone the clause.

Mr. Alderman W. LAWRENCE said, there seemed to be a sort of general feeling that London was going to take something by this clause, and that, therefore, it must be met with the most decided opposition. It was said that the prisons occupied land purchased by the State for that purpose, and that now there was an opportunity of using it for the benefit of the working classes of London. The Government proposed by this Bill that the sites should be used for the erection thereon of lodgings for those classes. Hon. Members would know how difficult it was to obtain sites in London suitable for such a purpose; and he appealed to hon. Gentlemen who had raised the present question to agree to the arrangement set forth in the clause. He was sure this was looked forward to by the inhabitants of London, and was considered one of the important features of the Bill. When the Law Courts were built, they were built not for the Metropolis, but for the whole of the country. They stood on land that was purchased compulsorily by Act of Parliament for the whole of the country—on land which had been covered with numerous courts and alleys of houses in which had been crowded a large population of the poorest and most needy character, nearly every room having been occupied by a separate family. Those poor people were turned out on a simple notice to quit, without the slightest care, attention, compensation, or provision for their future lodging. He contended that at that moment Parliament had an opportunity of causing the land of the prisons to be occupied by the working classes, as some compensation for those who were driven out of their homes when the Law Courts were built. Why should hon. Members come forward now and say—"Let us have the utmost farthing that these sites will sell for in the market. We say you ought to pay the amount into the Exchequer; and even though under the scheme you propose the charge which would be put upon our several towns would not be more than one-eighth of a penny, we make our demand on principle, and say you ought not to use these sites for the benefit of the working classes of the Metropolis?" He contended that they were discussing a trifle and endeavouring to make it a politico-economic debating ground, and that hon. Members were opposing the clause, not because they did not agree with what it would effect, but because it was against the principle of increased increment of property belonging to those who earned it. When they saw how readily large sums of money were voted for war expenses in all parts of the world, he was convinced the industrial classes would believe that the Committee neglected their interests, or did not entertain them in a proper manner, if, from a petty feeling as to the disposal of these sites, it refused to pass the clause. He had been very much struck by the cheers with which the statement that the sites should be used for the purposes of open spaces and recreation grounds was received. If that were done, nothing would be paid into the National Exchequer. Hon. Members did not ask that the full value should be paid for the land if it were given up to the purposes of recreation. He really did hope that the clause would pass without further discussion, and that hon. Members would not put themselves in opposition to the wishes of the mass of the people of this great Metropolis.

Mr. HOPWOOD thought hon. Members were entitled to an answer to the question whether this was or was not contentious Business? If the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer gave them an answer, he was sure he would give them a candid one, even if it were against himself. He (Mr. Hopwood) himself could not help thinking that there could be no doubt at all in the matter, and that it was most assuredly contentious Business. Yet the Ministry had promised that nothing with even the flavour of contentious Business should be brought on during the rest of the Session. As he understood it, a compromise had been offered—that the sites should be sold "for a fair market price, to be settled by agreement or arbitration," or words to that effect. If the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary would put these words at the end of the clause, leaving out all the words after the word "Works," in line 37, so that the clause would read—

> "To sell and convey those respective sites or any part or parts thereof to the Metropolitan Board of Works at a price to be fixed by agreement or arbitration,"

he could then frame a separate clause describing the Trust on which the Board of Works would hold the sites, and that, no doubt, would be accepted as a fair termination of the dispute. In this way the question of the sale of the land would be separated from the purpose to which it was to be applied. The question of fair market price would be left untrammelled, and the sites could be allocated to the purpose intended by the noble Proposer of the clause (the Marquess of Salisbury)—that was to say, to the setting up on them of some form of working men's dwellings. He (Mr. Hopwood) could very well understand that the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary felt bound to defend the clause. There was no doubt it had been a matter of warm contention between the Prime Minister and Lord Bramwell in "another place," and it was very natural that the Home Secretary should feel that in loyalty to his Chief he was bound to stand by the Bill; but, on the other hand, he (Mr. Hopwood) felt convinced that if the right hon. Gentleman's Chief were here, and had heard this discussion, he would at once relieve the right hon. Gentleman of any supposed obligation, and allow them to go on with the Bill, treating this as contentious Business, and expunging it from the Bill, or adopting the suggestion which he (Mr. Hopwood) had just made.

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER: The hon. and learned Gentleman (Mr. Hopwood) has made a direct appeal to me, and, of course, I am very glad to answer the question he has asked. He has asked me whether or not in my opinion this is contentious matter? If the epithet of contentious could be properly applied to ordinary matter of debate, on which the House is not seriously divided, although some hon. Gentlemen may not hold the views of the great majority, then, I admit, all our proceedings of the last three weeks ought not to have taken place; but if, on the other hand, contentious Business means matter on which the House is fairly divided, and which a large section of the House is unwilling to consider, there is nothing to prevent our proceeding further with the clause. I would remind the hon. and learned Gentleman that the discussion on this subject has really governed to a great extent the debate on this Bill, and that we have already had a division which has shown us that there are nearly 60 Members on one side, and only six on the other. I do not think that under these circumstances we have had sufficient proof that there is any real contention in the House in regard to that which is the subject of the debate. What I would suggest is this—that hon. Members who feel strongly on this matter cannot do better than put their opinions to the test of a division as soon as may be, in order that we may see what is the view of the Committee. My right hon. Friend has made a proposal to amend the clause which, as I understand, has been accepted as a reasonable settlement by more than one of those who, in previous discussions, spoke very strongly against the clause itself. If that is so, it certainly seems that the real opposition to the clause is very much less than was suggested by the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Stockport (Mr. Hopwood). In any case, let us try what it is. Her Majesty's Government would not care to press this clause on what may fairly be described as an unwilling House; but, on the other hand, if a great majority are in favour of passing it, I cannot see anything to prevent its adoption.

MR. J. R. HOLLOND said, he was not insensible of the effort the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had made to meet hon. Members in this matter; but he thought it must be clear to the right hon. Gentleman from what had taken place that that effort had not been entirely successful. There were a number of Members on that (the Opposition) side of the House who held such strong objection to the clause that he did not think he should be justified in withdrawing it.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 69; Noes 20: Majority 49.—(Div. List, No. 283.)

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he had a small Amendment to move, in line 32, to add, after the word "Treasury," the words "and subject to such conditions as they may think reasonable."

Amendment proposed,

In page 4, line 32, after the word "Treasury," to insert the words "and subject to such conditions as they may think reasonable."—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Amendment *agreed to*.

MR. BRYCE said, he wished to move to omit from lines 34 and 35 the words "if the Justices think fit so to do." He made this proposal for the reason that the Treasury in these matters would, of course, be the Executive Government. If the Executive Government should "think fit so to do," the Treasury would "think fit so to do;" and the Committee was, therefore, giving directions to the Government what was to be done. Well, the Government was amenable to Parliament, but the Justices of the county of Middlesex were not. He did not see why, if they took this step, they should leave the veto in the hands of the Justices. If the Act was to be complied with by the Treasury, he thought it should also be complied with by the Justices of Middlesex, so that the will of Parliament should be carried out.

It should not be left to those irresponsible persons to say whether the Act should be carried out or not.

Amendment proposed, in page 4, lines 34 and 35, leave out the words "if the Justices think fit so to do."—(*Mr. Bryce.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he could not consent to the omission of those words, because only in 1877 Parliament had given the Justices a direct Parliamentary title to deal with those prisons.

MR. BRYCE said, he could not see any reason for refusing the Amendment; but, of course, if there was a strong feeling in the Committee against it, he would not press it.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

MR. CHEETHAM said, he had proposed to move, in line 35, after "convey," to insert "at a fair market price." So much had been said on that subject that he would not enter further on the question; and if he understood rightly the offer of the right hon. Gentleman (Sir R. Assheton Cross), he proposed to include in the clause words to the same effect?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): Yes; I would move the Amendment I have put upon the Paper, with the addition of the words "as approved by the Secretary of State," after "Metropolis," in the last line, so that the Amendment will read—

> "For the purpose of the erection thereon by the Board or other parties, for the use of the working classes, buildings disposed in streets, squares, or otherwise, with or without open spaces, with power for such Board, as to all or any part of such sites, to lease the same to other persons, to be used for the purposes aforesaid, or to exchange the same for other land to be applied for like purposes, or to convert by sale the same into money, to be invested in land to be applied for like purposes, so that the land taken by exchange or sale be situate within the Metropolis as approved by the Secretary of State. The price for such sites shall be."

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: Does the right hon. Gentleman propose to add the words "fair market price?"

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): Yes; at the end.

Amendment proposed, in page 4, line 37, to leave out the word "at," and insert the words proposed.—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Question proposed, "That the word 'at' stand part of the Clause."

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE: The words—

> "Or to exchange the same for other land to be applied for like purposes, or to convert by sale the same into money, to be invested in land to be applied for like purposes, so that the land taken by exchange or sale be situate within the Metropolis as approved by the Secretary of State,"

are surely unnecessary. If a fair market value is to be taken, I do not see what object there can be in giving the Metropolitan Board this power of exchange or of converting into money.

SIR SYDNEY WATERLOW said, he wished to propose an Amendment to the Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. Member wish to add words?

SIR SYDNEY WATERLOW: I wish to propose an Amendment.

THE CHAIRMAN: But does the hon. Member propose to add to the original Amendment? If he does, we must get the words of the original Amendment in the Bill first.

SIR SYDNEY WATERLOW said, he wished to propose an alteration to the first part of the Amendment, so that it would read "for the purpose of the erection thereon by the Board by public competition." He had already fully explained his reasons for urging the acceptance of these words. He was surprised the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had not said one word as to the statement he (Sir Sydney Waterlow) had made about the Board by agreement letting large plots of land in the Metropolis at a price that had been distinctly, on the highest authority, stated to be far below what it would fetch if put up to public competiton. He wished to avoid that in the case of these prison sites. When the price was fixed by public competition no one could find fault.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, after the word "Board," to insert the words "by public competition." — (*Sir Sydney Waterlow.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

Mr. FIRTH said, he should like to put a question to the Home Secretary with regard to his proposal that the price should be the fair market value.

The CHAIRMAN: We are now on another Amendment.

Mr. BRYCE said, he wished to call attention to a point which arose under an earlier portion of the Amendment. The Amendment contained the words "with or without open spaces."

Mr. WARTON: That will come later on.

The CHAIRMAN: The Amendment before the Committee is to insert, after the word "Board," the words "by public competition."

Mr. BRYCE said, he hoped the Government would not accept this Amendment, or that the hon. Baronet would withdraw it. It would tend to narrow the purposes to which the land could be put. They must consider the interests of the working classes for whose benefit this land was to be acquired.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE did not think this Amendment, even if agreed to, could have much effect owing to the words which went before. The Board could take the land for other purposes if they pleased.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Mr. TOMLINSON said, he desired to move to omit from the second line of the Amendment the words "for the use of," in order to insert the words "suitable for." He moved the Amendment, because he feared that the retention of the words "for the use of" might lead to trouble.

Amendment proposed, to amend the said proposed Amendment, in line 2, by leaving out the words "for the use of," in order to insert the words "suitable for."—(*Mr. Tomlinson.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the proposed Amendment."

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, it was evident the hon. Member had not read the Report of the Committee.

Mr. TOMLINSON did not see what that had to do with his point at all. His point was that these words would constitute a trust with the precise letter of which it might not always be possible to comply. The words "suitable for" might obviate a great deal of difficulty.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Mr. BRYCE said, that if the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary was satisfied with the words of the clause as they now stood, he (Mr. Bryce) would not trouble the Committee with an Amendment; but he certainly thought that the words "with open spaces to a suitable extent" would be better than "with or without open spaces."

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross): I am satisfied with the words as they are.

Mr. BRYCE: They are not sufficient. We should make ample provision for the keeping of open spaces.

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross): I would propose to leave out the words "or without," in order to insert the word "suitable."

Mr. BRYCE: Agreed.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, in line 3, to omit the words "or without," in order to insert the word "suitable."—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Mr. TOMLINSON said, he wished to move something before that, in line 4, after the word "Board," to insert the words "or other parties."

Amendment *negatived.*

Mr. STAVELEY HILL said, that in line 7 of the Amendment there was an extraordinary statement, which showed that the Queen's English was not always plain English. The Amendment said, "or to convert by sale the same into money." He proposed to leave out the words "by sale."

Amendment *agreed to.*

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, that in order to make the clause clear, he should move, after "Metropolis," to add the words "having regard to the object for which they have to be used."

Mr. FIRTH wished to know whether the "fair market value" would be restricted to the purchase of sites for the purpose of erecting labourers' dwellings, or whether it was to be a fair market value for any purpose?

MR. JESSE COLLINGS took it that there was no doubt as to the purpose.

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, this illustrated the observation which he ventured to make some time ago. He had the greatest doubt in his mind as to what it meant; but he had not the slightest doubt that the Courts would hold that it meant the market value irrespective of the purpose.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): Strike out the words altogether.

MR. BRYCE said, he did not move his Amendment in consequence of the Amendment which had been carried.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he did not understand. Had the right hon. Gentleman struck out these words or not?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, yes; he had struck them out.

MR. BRYCE rose to Order. The Chairman had called upon him to move his Amendment, and he supposed that this matter was past and gone.

MR. FIRTH begged to move the words.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he would be glad to put back the words.

MR. BRYCE asked, as a point of O der, whether the Chairman had not called upon him for his subsequent Amendment, and he (Mr. Bryce) said he should not move it? He begged to ask also, if that were so, whether it was not conclusive that the point was passed?

THE CHAIRMAN said, he did not think the Rule applied in this case. There was some confusion at that point, and he thought the words might be put back.

MR. STAVELEY HILL: May I ask where we are?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is proposed to amend the Amendment—after the word "Metropolis," to insert the words "having regard to the object for which they have to be used."

MR. ALBERT GREY, on the point of Order, desired to know if the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had not risen in his place to move an Amendment in line 43, clearly showing that this point had been settled?

MR. JESSE COLLINGS, on the point of Order, said, he had risen to put another point before line 43; but he was told that they had not come to that, and, therefore, he had not put it. These words had been put in to make the clause clear, and, therefore, he trusted that his hon. Friend would not endeavour by a side wind to interfere with it.

MR. PICTON wished to make an appeal to the Home Secretary. He thought that they were all agreed that there was a strong feeling as to this clause, and as to the evil principle involved in selling land at its market value. At all events, what they understood that the right hon. Gentleman had conceded was that the land was not to be sold below its value. Now, the right hon. Gentleman had moved the addition of words which made it entirely different from what was understood, and which would have the effect of reducing the value of the land. It was a complete abandonment of the concession made, and he did ask that the clause should be restored to its original shape.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) remarked, that he had offered a compromise which was first accepted and then rejected, and, on a division, those who refused it were beaten. The words he now proposed to add would only make clear the principle he had held all through—that it was to be a fair market price for land for the erection of labourers' dwellings.

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE reminded the right hon. Gentleman that at the time he seemed to think it was a very important Amendment he was making; but with the words which he was now adding it was really no concession at all.

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

On the Motion of the SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross), the following Amendment made: — Page 4, line 43, after "respectively," insert—

"And that the sale may be made on condition of the cesser or transfer of any liability in respect of the maintenance of any road or embankment."

MR. CHEETHAM, on behalf of the hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Lyulph Stanley), begged to move the Amendment standing in his hon. Friend's name, which was as follows:—Page 3, line 43, at end, add—

"Provided also, That, in the event of the above sites or any part of them being applied to the purposes of the Labouring Classes' Lodging Houses Act, such portions as, in the opinion of the Education Department, may be necessary for the purpose of erecting schools for the population so brought on to the above sites shall be reserved for the School Board for London, and the said School Board shall be empowered to buy such portions from the Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury at a price not exceeding their fair market value."

Question proposed, "That those words be there added."

Mr. TOMLINSON, as an Amendment to the Amendment, wished to introduce, after the word "London," the words "or any public elementary school."

Question put, "That those words be there inserted."

The Committee *divided:* — Ayes 66; Noes 32: Majority 34. — (Div. List, No. 284.)

Question proposed, "That the words, as amended, be added to the Clause."

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS begged leave to move that the Chairman report Progress, and ask leave to sit again. The Government, under the guise of a Bill for Housing the Poor, had supported a proposal which would virtually have the effect of subsidizing denominational schools.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Jesse Collings.*)

The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, the hon. Member would see that was not so. If he had thought about the schools at all, he should have objected to the Amendment of the hon. Member for Oldham (Mr. Lyulph Stanley). Having put in the School Board of London, he saw no reason why they should not put in the other public schools. The site for such a school would not be in any sense a gift, because the land would have to be purchased at the fair market value, and he saw no reason for making any difference.

Mr. JESSE COLLINGS said, he quite understood operating for the benefit of the ratepayers, or of a body supported by the rates; but it was quite another matter to assist private institutions.

Mr. ONSLOW: I rise to Order. The Question before the Committee is that you, Sir, do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. SHAW LEFEVRE said, he disliked the Amendment very much; but he would not advise the hon. Member (Mr. Jesse Collings) to persist in his Motion for reporting Progress.

Mr. BROADHURST said, he thought the hon. Gentleman the Member for Ipswich had moved to report Progress on the ground that the London School Board was a Public Body, but that the other schools who would be admitted to the advantages of the clause were not. [*Cries of* "Question!" *and* "Order!"]

The CHAIRMAN: I must call the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that the Question before the Committee is that I do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BROADHURST: I am aware of that fact, Sir; but I understand it is always in Order to give reasons why we should report Progress. Of course, if you rule that no reasons are be given, I will sit down.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member must not discuss the merits or demerits of any previous proposal.

Mr. BROADHURST said, he would not do so. The reason for moving to report Progress was that the Bill had entirely changed its character by the Amendment which had just been supported by the Government. Though the Government Tellers had not acted in the division, yet nearly every Member of the Government had supported the Amendment, and the Bill had entirely changed its character and no longer had any claim to the title which had been given it. He thought the hon. Gentleman the Member for Ipswich should divide the Committee.

Sir CHARLES W. DILKE said, he would make an appeal to the hon. Gentleman not to divide. He had found that the words of the Amendment would not make sense, and on that ground more than on any other he opposed the proposal. If hon. Gentlemen would come up to the Table and look at the words of the Amendment they would see that they would not read. They would give power to the London School Board to take land for denominational schools, so far as he could see—a thing which the London School Board could not do.

Question put.

The Committee *divided*:—Ayes 22; Noes 82: Majority 60.—(Div. List, No. 285.)

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE: I would suggest that the difficulty should be met by abandoning the whole Amendment. These words would be mere nonsense.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): I agree. Nothing is further from my intention than to introduce any religious element in this Bill, or to raise a question as between the school board and voluntary schools. I would propose to leave out the whole Amendment.

Question, "That the words, as amended, be added to the Clause," put, and *negatived.*

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

MR. ALBERT GREY said, he wished to propose that the clause be struck out of the Bill. [*A laugh.*] The right hon. Gentleman (Sir R. Assheton Cross) laughed; but they must remember that they had been discussing the Bill for three hours under an entire misconception as to what were the principles of the Government with regard to it. The measure raised some importan tprinciples, and the House was bound not to pass it without understanding what it meant. Unless the Government withdrew the whole clause, as they had withdrawn the Amendment dealing with school boards and denominational schools, the effect of the provision there was no doubt would be to transfer the property of the State at a sum far below its market value to a small section of the community. There was no doubt about that whatsoever. What loss the State would sustain was uncertain, but it had been estimated at a large sum—amounting to £400,000 or £500,000. Now he, as the Representative of the electors of a large constituency in the North of England, objected to the loss that they as members of the State would sustain in consenting to the State parting with their property at a sum so much below its real value. There was one argument which he would especially present to the attention of hon. Gentlemen opposite. The effect of this Bill was to give Parliamentary sanction to the giving away of the unearned increment in the case of State property to a small section of the community. ["Oh, oh!"] An hon. Friend below grumbled at the phrase, "small section of the community;" but the clause would not affect the whole of the people of England. They were going to sell the prison at Millbank at a sum below its value. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) yesterday afternoon made use of the argument that the people of London had suffered injury through losses sustained under various Act of Parliament. The right hon. Gentleman had referred to the Acts which had legalized the construction of the Midland Railway Terminus and a similar group of works. But, after all, what argument was that? Because the people of St. Pancras had suffered, the people living in the neighbourhood of Millbank Prison were to get housing below its market value! Such an argument as that would not hold water. If a certain section of the community were entitled to receive unearned increment because the Government could put its finger upon certain Acts of Parliament which had done injury to the people of London where were they to stop? It would be just as good an argument to say that because a certain number of people in the country had largely suffered owing to the policy of Protection being done away with 40 years ago, therefore unearned increment attaching to the State property should go to them. It would not be a difficult thing to prove that most people had suffered in consequence of most Acts of Parliament; but the fact of their having so suffered was no reason why Parliament should now come forward and make them a present of property which belonged to the whole State. The principle on which he based his objection to the clause was that it was practically by Act of Parliament giving over the unearned increment to a portion of the community. The right hon. Gentleman the President of the Local Government Board said that that was not the case; but he was a Member of great dialectical subtlety—he could cavil on the ninth part of a hair with great ingenuity, but the electorate had not the same ingenuity as the right hon. Gentleman. All they could see was that by this Bill, brought in by the Marquess of Salisbury, and introduced into this House by a Conservative Government, the unearned increment was taken and devoted to a certain portion of the community because it was contended that that increment had resulted from that community. That was a principle that his hon. Friend the Member for Ipswich (Mr. Jesse Collings) intended to push. The hon. Member was, he believed, about to agitate the country on that principle, and to point to the example of the Marquess of Salisbury and the House of Lords, and say—"What the Marquess of Salisbury declares is right, we also declare is right, and we ask you to push the principle a little further." Whether hon. Members liked it or not, they would have to face an agitation on that principle if they passed this Bill—they would have an Act of Parliament at which the finger of the agitator—it might be an ignorant agitator—would be pointed, and pointed with effect. Those agitators would point to this Act of Parliament, and would call upon the electors to support similar proposals. If the Committee wished to prevent that agitation the best thing it could do would be to drop this clause out of the Bill altogether. If the Government did that, he was sure that the effect would be to sustain and speed the passage of the Bill through the House.

MR. STAVELEY HILL said, he had much pleasure in seconding the proposal of the hon. Member for South Northumberland (Mr. A. Grey) to strike this clause out of the Bill, and he did so especially on the first ground that the hon. Member had put forward. The question seemed to stand thus. Take Pentonville and Coldbath Fields; they had been bought with the money of the whole country—of Londoners, of the inhabitants of Northumberland, of Staffordshire, Warwickshire, and all other parts of England—the property was the property of the whole country. What was it that was proposed to be done with it? A certain course of things had brought into the neighbourhood of the land upon which those prisons stood a great number of inhabitants. Those inhabitants had been living there, benefiting the whole of the property of London; therefore, anything done for their benefit ought to be paid for out of the rates by the ratepayers of London. Those people had increased the value of the property of these very ratepayers. The persons who ought to support those poor people were those who had had their property increased in value by those poor people coming amongst them. What was it the Committee were going to do? Why, they were going to take, by this clause, the property of the people of England, and dispose of it for the purpose of easing the rates of the ratepayers of London. That was manifestly unfair and unjust. As to the other statements of the hon. Member, he (Mr. Staveley Hill) contended that on every principle of justice this clause had no right to be in the Bill. They had no right to take the property of the people of England and sell it for the purpose of easing the rates of the ratepayers of London, who ought to pay any extraordinary charge for the maintenance of those people who had enhanced the value of their property.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he had already alluded to this clause in what he had said with regard to this Bill yesterday; but it must be remembered that the State was unable to make an equitable use of its property. ["No, no!"] Yes; unless they gave statutory powers, the State would not be able to make an equitable use of this property. They would be obliged to exact the utmost farthing. Under the 12th clause of the Bill, it would be seen that they were giving private owners the same power which it was proposed by this clause to give to the State. These provisions said that, having regard to the circumstances of particular localities—such as the crowded parts of Finsbury, the like of which was not to be seen anywhere else in the United Kingdom—the State should be able to do—so said the 3rd clause—what they were enabling private owners to do by other parts of the Bill. They had had it in evidence on the Commission that the Duke of Westminster was altering his settlements—that in making new ones he had put into them terms similar to those which had been introduced into Section 12 of this Bill. Unless such a power was given to the State, the State would be unable to do anything of the kind, and would be obliged to exact the utmost farthing of its right. That was a case for the clause which had not yet been made in this discussion.

MR. STOREY said, the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) must have been very hard pushed for an argument when he resorted to the one which he had just addressed to the Committee. Under the 12th clause, he said, they allowed the owners of settled estates to do this very thing; but the owners of settled estates only dealt with their own property. They did not deal with his (Mr. Storey's) property; and he maintained that what they were now doing under the 3rd clause was to take public property—that was, his property, for one, for he had an interest in it as well as the rest of the public—and give it to the people of London. He wished the Committee exactly to understand, just once for all, what his views on this matter were, and he desired to state them now, so that it might not be necessary for him to trouble the Committee with them again. He did not object to these sites being acquired for building houses for the working classes of the country—on the contrary, he should very much desire that these sites should be so applied—and he did not object to the people of London obtaining the benefit of them, if they were purchased through their constituted authorities out of the rates. If the Bill authorized the State to sell to the Municipality of London, or allowed a competition in which the Metropolitan Board of Works, as representing the ratepayers of London, might take a part in acquiring these sites at a fair value, he should not have objected to its being allowed to do so. This was a matter that concerned London, and was one for the ratepayers of London to consider; but what were they now proposing to do? They were proposing to take the property which belonged to the people in the North quite as much as to the people in the South, and to appropriate it for the erection of dwellings for the benefit of the South. He was not going to give the Government the somewhat Jesuitical advice that some of his Radical Friends had given, for some of them had advised the Government to proceed in this course, believing it to be the first step on a steep and slippery declivity down which, when they had once commenced the descent, they would roll very quickly. He wanted to deal honestly with them, and he did not wish them to take that course, for he wished to tell them that, if they did, he knew very well what would follow. In his own town of Sunderland, they were as badly off in this respect as the people in London. They had spent £90,000 out of their own pockets to obtain decent dwellings for working men and artizans. They had no public property in Sunderland; but if Parliament took the property of the State and applied it to the benefit of the people of London, depend upon it they would come with trumpet-tongue from Sunderland and say—"We have no public property in the North; you have public property in the South, by means of which you have benefited the people of the South; devote some of your public property to our benefit also." He was not very much surprised to see some Members of the Government adopting that course; but he saw on the Front Bench opposite some hon. Members who had in past times both written and spoken much more sensible and reasonable things on this subject than the Committee was hearing from them now. They used to take a much wiser and more Conservative view of matters; and he now counselled them not to take this step, which they seemed bent upon taking that night, because it was not merely Socialistic—that he could forgive—but it was unjust; and they had no right to apply a principle of injustice in dealing with public property.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, the right hon. Gentleman (Sir Charles W. Dilke) had used an argument which was not quite correct, because this clause contained a provision stating that this property might be bought at cost price, and he was not aware of any settlement either of the Duke of Westminster or anyone else which contained, or was likely to contain, any such provision. The clause contained at the end the following Proviso:—

> "Provided that the price shall not be less than the price paid for the land when it was purchased on behalf of Her Majesty or of the county of Middlesex respectively."

That meant that the land was to be purchased at cost price. Some hon. Members on that (the Opposition) side of the House were inclined to think that the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had made a compromise that evening; but he (Mr. Arnold) called it a delusion. It was no concession whatever, and the clause would contain in the Proviso now in it all the objectionable features which had been mentioned on the second reading and on the Motion for going into Committee. He wished to call the attention of Her Majesty's Government to the remarks of the Leader of the House (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach) himself, when at an earlier hour of the evening he had defined what contentious matter was. The right hon. Baronet had stated that if they regarded as contentious matter that which was subject of debate none of their proceedings of the past three months would have taken place. But the last three months were not in question. [The Chancellor of the Exchequer: Three weeks, I said.] He begged the right hon. Gentleman's pardon. He also had been alluding to a question of weeks. The right hon. Baronet had proceeded to define contentious matter as matter upon which the House was fairly divided. He would ask the right hon. Baronet whether, after the last division but one, which showed that the opponents of the clause numbered more than half its supporters, he did not regard the Committee as fairly divided in opinion? Without going into the question of division he (Mr. Arnold) would call the attention of the right hon. Baronet to the speeches which had been made in regard to this clause from both sides of the House. From that side of the House the majority of speeches—like those of the hon. Members for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot), South Leicestershire (Mr. Pell), and West Staffordshire (Mr. Staveley Hill), had all been against the clause; whilst on the other side of the House, with the exception of the two Metropolitan Members—the right hon. Baronet the Member for Chelsea (Sir Charles W. Dilke) and the hon. Alderman the Member for the City of London (Mr. Alderman Lawrence)—all the speeches had been against the clause, except those of his hon. Friend the Member for Ipswich (Mr. Jesse Collings) and the hon. Member for Stoke (Mr. Broadhurst), who had avowedly supported the clause because they thought that in the future they might be able to claim the increment of value not only upon the property of the State, but also upon the property of the Marquess of Salisbury in London. He warned his hon. Friends that that was a delusion. It was like the Amendment which came from the Benches opposite. There was no question whatever that the principle adopted in this clause did strengthen the contention of his hon. Friend as to the public having a right to share in the increment of value but the error his hon. Friend made was this. They supported the clause because they believed that through the whole increment of value being given to the population of London, therefore in the case of private owners they could equitably claim the whole of the increment of value. They were right in the contention that the clause did strengthen their expectation—it did confirm the public right to a share in the increment of value in the Metropolis and throughout the Kingdom. Take another case. A year or two ago Her Majesty's Government proposed to take a small strip of land in St. James's Park for the purpose of erecting on it the new War and Admiralty Offices. There was a very strong claim indeed on the part of the people of London to the possession of the land. The last penny, however, was demanded by the Commissioners of Woods and Forests to be paid down for the few yards of ground taken from the St. James's Park for the site of that building. From the point of view of the Commissioners of Woods and Forests, this was a fair transaction; but, in his opinion, it was one which it was impossible to defend. The proceedings of the Committee on the clause now under discussion surely proved that Her Majesty's Government had not observed the pledge they had given the House not to proceed with any contentious Business. The opinion of the Committee was certainly fairly divided upon the clause, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said that when that was the case upon any question, after the Government had given a pledge not to proceed with contentious matter, that question ought to be allowed to drop. If the Government were well-advised in this matter, they would certainly not proceed further with the clause; for unless they consented to abandon it a very small amount of confidence would be felt in their promises upon either side of the House in the future.

Mr. HORACE DAVEY said, that earlier in the evening he had expressed the strong objection he felt to the clause, and he had no desire to repeat anything he had already said. He wished, however, to express his astonishment at the theory which had been started by the Chancellor of the Exchequer as to the nature and character of contentious Business. He should have thought that the right hon. Gentleman would have been satisfied by that time that the clause evidently amounted to contentious Business. The right hon. Gentleman said—"Let us have a division to test it;" but the right hon. Gentleman forgot that many right hon. and hon. Members had left the House for the country on the faith of what was understood to be a promise by the Government that no contentious Business would be taken. Had not the statement of the Chancellor of the Exchequer been so understood, he felt sure that many hon. Members who took an interest in the question would have made arrangements to be present during the discussion upon the clause. He would point out to the Government that less than one-fifth of the Members of the House were now present. Of course, under such circumstances, at the end of a Session, the Government had great advantages, because it had the votes of the Members of the Government itself, as well as those of hon. Gentlemen who supported it, on this matter. He had not heard any observations in reply to the remarks of the hon. Member for Salford (Mr. Arnold) and other hon. Gentlemen as to the strong opinions which were entertained against the clause. It had by no means been shown that the clause would operate for the benefit of the working classes, as it was intended to do. It proposed to give power to the Justices of Middlesex to sell land to the Metropolitan Board of Works at a reduced price, and the Metropolitan Board would be enabled either to build houses themselves or to grant land to other people for that purpose. Suppose they built houses themselves — and he should decidedly object to their doing so—what on earth was there in the clause to show what rents they should charge for them? The Metropolitan Board was left absolutely free to charge any rent they pleased, so that they would be able to impose competitive or rack-rents upon the working classes. Suppose, on the other hand, they granted leases. Such leases would, he presumed, be granted to builders who would undertake to build houses for the working classes; and the builders—although, no doubt, they would be benevolent persons—would not be actuated in the matter entirely by philanthropic motives. They would invest their money in the houses they put up with a view to profit; and what was to prevent them letting the houses, when erected, to the artizans of the Metropolis at any rents they pleased? There might be something in the clause which would prevent them, but he had certainly not been able to discover any provision of that character. Perhaps, if such a safeguard existed, the Home Secretary would tell the Committee where to find it? As far as he could discover, there was really nothing in the clause which, in the least degree, restricted the Metropolitan Board, or the builders, from letting the houses, when they were erected, at competitive rents. Under these circumstances, the great boon and advantage which the clause proposed to confer on the working classes would not reach their hands, or tend to reduce the rents they would have to pay; but would operate either to the benefit of the ratepayers of the Metropolis, or, if the Metropolitan Board granted leases, as would probably be the case, to men who built with a view of making a profit, it would result in enabling them to obtain the leases at lower rates, and to charge competitive rents to those who became the inhabitants of the houses. The effect would, therefore, probably be that the builders, and not the working classes, would obtain the benefits which were sought to be conferred upon the latter.

Mr. BUCHANAN said, that although he had in the division which had already taken place voted with the hon. Members who had initiated the discussion, he had not yet addressed the Committee, and he wished now to state why he was strongly opposed to this clause. As to the question of what was and what was not contentious Business, he thought that contentious matter might be regarded as matter which involved a disputed principle; and certainly the clause involved a principle of a highly contentious character. The question of principle now at issue was whether Parliament ought, or ought not, to make a large grant in aid, out of the public funds, to the ratepayers of the Metropolis. It was proposed to make such a grant at the most dangerous moment that could have been selected—that was to say, on the eve of a General Election which would involve a large increase—in the representation of the Metropolis. Considering that there were some 60 seats in the Metropolis, under the Parliamentary Elections (Redistribution) Bill, and that all of them were to be contested, it was impossible to shut one's eyes to the consequences which must ensue from the adoption of such a clause as that under discussion. The Committee had seen the hon. Gentleman the Member for Chelsea (Mr. Firth) and the hon. Gentleman the Member for the City of London (Alderman Lawrence) acting together on this question in a way in which he did not think they had ever acted together on a Metropolitan question before. The clause involved a question of public morality, and the Government were settting a bad precedent, which might result in grave danger to the nation at large.

Mr. CAUSTON remarked, that he had taken no part in the discussion of the various Amendments which had been brought forward; but he could not allow the debate upon this clause to close without joining in the appeal which had been made to the Government in regard to it. He could quite understand that, from the point of view of the London ratepayers, it would be highly desirable that they should have national property handed over to one of their Governing Bodies without any expense whatever. But the property under discussion belonged as much to his constituents as it did to those who lived in London or in other towns, and he could not see his way to support a clause which did an act of injustice to those whose interests in this property were equal with those of the ratepayers of London. In fact, he protested against his constituents being taxed for the benefit of the Metropolitan ratepayers.

Mr. TOMLINSON thought the Committee ought not to be allowed to go to a division upon the clause under any misapprehension. As he understood the section, as modified in Committee, it did not really give to the working classes of London what had been called a great boon. The proposal, as it now stood, was that the land might be acquired by the Metropolitan Board at a fair market value, having regard to the fact that it was to be used for building houses. He did not know the relative values of land intended as a site for houses and land meant to be used as a site for factories in the Metropolis; but in the manufacturing districts land was usually sold at a lower price for factories than for houses. When, therefore, hon. Members talked about giving an unearned increment to the people of London, they ought to be careful that they were not exaggerating what the clause was intended to do. The reason on which the propriety of restricting the purpose to which the land was to be applied was based was that in past times Parliament had authorized the appropriation of large portions of land occupied by the houses of the working classes to public objects, and that, consequently, it owed something to those classes. If, therefore, the clause had the limited effect which he believed it had, it would not, he thought, go beyond what was fair. At the same time, he could not but feel that the clause did seem to involve some contentious matter.

Mr. BRYCE said, he had no desire to continue the discussion respecting the merits or demerits of the clause, but wished to make one more appeal to the Government upon the subject. He really did put it to the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether the course of the debate upon the clause did not conclusively show that the matter it involved was contentious Business, such as the right hon. Gentleman stated six weeks ago would not be proceeded with? There was evidently a great deal of disagreement in the Committee, and a large number of Members entertained the most serious objections to the proposals which the section contained. Surely the Government must remember that those hon. Members who had gone into the country had done so on the faith of the promise which had been made that no sort of contentious Business would be brought forward, and in the belief that the pledge the Government had given would be loyally adhered to. Were not Ministers taking an unfair advantage of the absence of those hon. Members to press a clause of this kind? He was sure the Government did not wish to violate the pledge they had given;

but, in point of fact, they would violate that pledge if they continued to press the clause. Let them not rely upon the fact that they had obtained a large majority in the division upon the Motion to go into Committee on the Bill. The arguments of the opponents of the clause had been addressed to empty Benches, and when the division was called the supporters of the Government flocked into the House and voted as directed by their Whips. That was not the kind of majority that was contemplated by the Constitution in a matter of this kind. There ought to be a substantial majority of the Members of the House upon a question which, like this, involved a far-reaching principle, and not a majority consisting of Members who did not enter the House until the division bells were rung. He appealed to the Government to consider what would be their moral position in the appreciation of those hon. Members who had gone into the country, and what such Members would think of a Ministry which passed a clause of this kind under such circumstances and in such a thin House. If the Government gave way on this point, he could assure them that the rest of the Bill would pass with little or no trouble, because this was the only clause to which any serious objection was entertained.

MR. PELL said, that before the debate concluded he desired to draw attention to the differences in the proposals made by the Government. Ministers were content to sell Government property at a price below its real value in the interests of the poor. They said the question was one of such paramount importance to the poor that they were willing to sacrifice a great principle and to sell State property under its proper value. But when those who had charge of the Bill came to deal with similar property belonging to the county, they set aside the principle which guided them in regard to State property, and they protected the ratepayers of Middlesex by saying that the land should not be devoted to the purpose intended unless the Justices of the Peace of the county of Middlesex should think fit. They threw overboard the paramount interest of the poor—that interest which, he believed, had guided them in a wrong direction—they cast it aside when they came to deal with county property. They said—"We will not do what we have some suspicion is not quite right unless the Justices of the Peace agree with us in doing it." It was evident that whoever counselled the drafting of the Bill had in their minds a very grave doubt whether they were doing right. They thought that public opinion would carry them through in dealing with State property; but they were afraid to face the Justices of Middlesex, who, no doubt, would be harassed by the ratepayers of the county if they agreed to part with their property on any other than the best possible terms. If the clause were passed, what would be its effect in other cases? In the very centre of the principal town of the county which he represented (South Leicestershire) was a large portion of property owned by the county. The Castle of Leicester, which had great historical associations, and a very large tract of ground, including that covered by the Militia buildings, belonged to the county. At some not very distant time he knew it was contemplated to part with this land. If the present clause were passed, in what position would the magistrates of the county of Leicester be if the borough of Leicester, quoting this 3rd clause as a precedent, interfered with the sale of county property in the interests of the labouring classes of Leicester, and insisted that a valuation should be put upon it in order that every opportunity might be given for the erection of artizans' dwellings? If the Committee passed this clause, it would, as a consequence, reduce the selling value of every acre of land in the Kingdom belonging to counties. If, under these circumstances, the clause did not involve contentious matter, he did not know what would, and he could not see why the Government should not cut the proposal out of the Bill. It was not universal philanthropy, but London philanthropy, that animated the supporters of the clause. Why confine all this goodness to London? The reason was that the Government had got hold of State property in London, and they thought they could deal with it in a manner to render themselves acceptable to the electors of the Metropolis. The arguments which had been used in the course of the debate were, he thought, sufficiently strong to show that there was great doubt whether, on the whole, such a use of this land as was proposed would be the most beneficial to the poor. An hon. Member had said that it would be better to leave the prison sites as open spaces. He (Mr. Pell) did not understand that the hon. Gentleman meant they should be given by the Treasury for such a purpose; but that a price might be paid for them. Depend upon it, a great open space would be one of the most desirable things to have in the midst of a crowded population, and he did not know that the authorities would be doing the best they could for the people in building over the prison sites. Those being his views on the question, he hoped the hon. Member for South Northumberland (Mr. Albert Grey) would divide the Committee, and that the Government would hesitate still more before they consented to facilitate the progress of this clause.

Mr. DILLWYN trusted that the Government would yield to the appeal which had been made to them in regard to this clause, although he did not agree with every word which had been said against it. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had given a very decided pledge that no contentious Business should be taken at the end of the Session, and he appealed to the right hon. Gentleman to say whether he could now doubt that this was a contentious clause. He knew the right hon. Gentleman had listened to the debate with great attention, and that he must have heard many speakers condemning it on one ground or another, especially on the very strong ground that many Members who had left town would have opposed the clause if they had not thought it would have been regarded as contentious, and, therefore, would not have been pressed.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that when he last spoke on the subject he had ventured to point out what appeared to him to be the difference between non-contentious and contentious Business, and he had appealed to the result of the division in which six voted on one side against something like 60 on the other. Since that time there had been another division, in which he was bound to admit that the minority of six had increased to 20.

An hon. Member: No; 30.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER: No; that was on another point.

An hon. Member: It was the same principle.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, the division to which he referred showed that 20 Members opposed the clause. Well, he did not think that quite bore out the contention of the hon. Member for Swansea (Mr. Dillwyn), that there was a large number of Members who were opposed to the clause. Twenty was not a large number. What he would suggest to the Committee was this—that they might now fairly come to a division upon the clause, and if the result of that division was to show an increasing number against the clause the Government would not proceed with it.

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 75; Noes 29: Majority 46.—(Div. List, No. 286.)

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD begged to move that the Chairman do now report Progress, in order to give the Chancellor of the Exchequer an opportunity for stating what course he proposed to take, as there had been an increased vote on the Opposition side of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Arthur Arnold.*)

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, he did not think it would be right to discuss the subject now. He quite agreed with the hon. Gentleman that the minority was increasing, and, therefore, what he proposed to do was to leave the clause as it stood for the present, and to amend the words relating to the value on Report.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment of Artizans' Dwellings Acts, 1868 to 1882.

Clause 4 (Amendment of 31 & 32 Vic. c. 130, and 42 & 43 Vic. c. 64. 45 & 46 Vic. c 54.)

Mr. J. R. HOLLOND moved to omit "Sub-section (2.)" When the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary (Sir R. Assheton Cross) was speaking on this sub-section yesterday, he spoke of it as if it applied only to Vestries in the Metropolis. He (Mr. Hollond) could not help thinking that when this sub-section was drawn the draftsman had in his mind the difficulty experienced in inducing Vestries to carry out Torrens's Acts. If that was so, there was nothing whatever in the sub-section which limited it to the Metropolis.

Amendment proposed, to leave out Sub-section (2.)—(*Mr. Hollond.*)

Question proposed, "That the sub-section stand part of the Clause."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) assented to the Amendment.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, he did not think he could offer any objection to this sub-section being omitted.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Amendment of Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Acts.

Clause 5 (Amendment of 38 & 39 Vic. c. 36, s. 8, and schedule; 42 & 43 Vic. c. 63; 45 & 46 Vic. c. 54, schedule).

On Motion of The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross), the following Amendment made:—Page 5, line 25, leave out "in England," and insert "in the United Kingdom."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) proposed to insert, as separate paragraphs, after line 25—

"(2.) In either of the following cases:

(a.) Where an officer of health has reported to any local authority in the metropolis, exclusive of the City of London, either in pursuance of 'The Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Act, 1868,' that any premises are in a condition or state dangerous to health, so as to be unfit for human habitation, or in pursuance of section eight of 'The Artizans' Dwellings Act, 1832,' that the pulling down of any obstructive buildings would be expedient, and such authority resolve that the case of such premises or buildings is of such general importance to the Metropolis that it should be dealt with by a scheme under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Acts, 1875 to 1882; or

(b.) Where any such official representation as mentioned in section three of 'The Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875,' has been made to the Metropolitan Board of Works in relation to any houses, courts, or alleys within a certain area, and the Metropolitan Board of Works resolve that the case of such houses, courts, or alleys, is not of general importance to the Metropolis, and should be dealt with under the Artisans' Dwellings Acts 1868 to 1882;

such local authority or board may submit such resolution to one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, and thereupon the Secretary of State may appoint an arbitrator, and direct him to hold a local inquiry, and such arbitrator shall hold such inquiry, and report to the Secretary of State as to whether, having regard to the size of the area, to the number of houses to be dealt with, to the position, structure, and sanitary condition of such houses, and of the neighbourhood thereof, and to the provisions of section three of 'The Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Act, 1875,' the case is either wholly or partially of any and what importance to the Metropolis at large, with power to such arbitrator to report that in the event of the case being dealt with under the Artizans' Dwellings Acts, 1868 to 1882, the Metropolitan Board of Works ought to make a contribution in respect of the expense of dealing with the case. The Secretary of State, after considering the report of the arbitrator, may, according as to him seems just, decide that the case shall be dealt with either under the Artizans' Dwellings Acts, 1868 to 1882, or under the Artizans' and Labourers' Dwellings Improvement Acts, 1875 to 1882, and the officer of health or other proper officer shall forthwith make the report or official representation necessary for proceedings in accordance with such decision."

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SHAW LEFEVRE entirely approved of the Amendment of the right hon. Gentleman, but desired to ask a question with reference to it. According to his speech on the second reading, the right hon. Gentleman thought that the Metropolitan Board should be subject to the High Court of Justice—that was to say, that the High Court of Justice should have power by *mandamus* to carry out the schemes of the Artizans' Dwellings Act. What he wished to know was whether the Amendment the right hon. Gentleman now proposed would have that effect—whether it would be competent for the Home Secretary or any individual to apply to the High Court of Justice to call upon the Metropolitan Board or other Local Authority to carry out the schemes under the Artizans' Dwellings Act?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, that when he spoke the other night, he had in his mind another Amendment to the clause, in which there was to be a special application to the High Court.

MR. HOPWOOD said, the practice in such cases was, as the right hon. Gentleman knew, for the Secretary of State to send down an Inspector to report upon the matter. Let him mention the sort of case which might arise. Suppose that in a parish or district certain houses were a discredit to the neighbourhood in which they were, and should be pulled down. If the parish authorities made a scheme, it was brought before the confirming authority, and the Metropolitan Board of Works were expected to do the work. If the Metropolitan Board of Works refused to do it, the parish complaining applied to the Secretary of State, who sent down an Inspector to report. The Report might possibly be to the effect that the work was so small that it ought to be done by the Local Authority. He presumed the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary was moving this Amendment so that he might compel the one or the other to do the work?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, that supposing a scheme was sent up to the Metropolitan Board of Works, and they said it ought to be carried out by the Vestry, then the Secretary of State had power to send down a gentleman to report as to what was best to be done. Upon that Report the Secretary of State would decide who ought to undertake the work. An Order would be issued in the ordinary way, and the Metropolitan Board of Works would not then be able to say it was too small, and ought to be done by the Vestry.

MR. J. R. HOLLOND presumed the Secretary of State might suggest to the Metropolitan Board of Works that they might make a contribution?

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): Yes.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) moved to leave out the 2nd sub-section (2), in line 26.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Amendment as to Interest on Public Works Loans.

Clause 6 (Rates of loan by Public Works Loan Commissioners) *agreed to.*

Amendment of General Sanitary Law, &c.

Clause 7 (General duty of Local Authority to enforce the law) *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Amendment of 38 & 39 Vic. c. 55, s. 90) *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Bye-laws for hop and fruit pickers) *struck out.*

Clause 10 (Tents and vans used for human habitation.

On Motion of The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross), the following Amendments made:—Page 7, line 24, after "vans," insert "sheds."

Page 7, line 28, at end of line, insert as fresh paragraphs—

"(3.) Where any person duly authorised by a sanitary authority or by a justice of the peace has reasonable cause to suppose either that there is any contravention of the provisions of this Act or any bye-law made under this Act in any tent, van, shed, or similar structure used for human habitation, or that there is in any such tent, van, shed, or structure any person suffering from a dangerous infectious disorder, he may on producing (if demanded) either a copy of his authorisation purporting to be certified by the clerk or a member of the sanitary authority or some other sufficient evidence of his being authorised as aforesaid, enter by day such tent, van, shed, or structure, and examine the same and every part thereof in order to ascertain whether in such tent, van, shed, or structure there is any contravention of any such bye-law or a person suffering from a dangerous infectious disorder.

(4.) For the purposes of this section 'day' means the period between six o'clock in the morning and the succeeding nine o'clock in the evening.

(5.) If such person is obstructed in the performance of his duty under this section, the person so obstructing shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a fine not exceeding *forty shillings.*

(6.) This section shall apply to the Metropolis, with the substitution of section nineteen of 'The Sanitary Act, 1866,' for section ninety-one of 'The Public Health Act, 1875,' and of nuisance authority, under the Nuisance Removal Acts, for sanitary authority."

Line 29, after "van," insert "shed."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 11 (Application of certain provisions as to bye-laws and local inquiries) *agreed to.*

Clause 12 (Amendment of 45 & 46 Vic. c. 38, as regards the erection of buildings for working classes) *agreed to.*

Clause 13 (Condition to be implied on letting unfurnished house).

MR. HORACE DAVEY proposed to leave out the Preamble of the clause. He did not see the necessity of the Preamble; besides, in his opinion, it amounted to an erroneous statement of the law, and he did not like to crystalize on the Statute Book so doubtful a statement of law. In proposing his Amendment he did not mean to differ from the principle which he understood was intended to be embodied in the clause—namely, that when a house was let for habitation it was implied by law that the house was fit for the purpose for which it was let. He did not dispute that principle; and he was quite ready to agree to the passing of a clause to that effect. He did not know whether the Home Secretary had done him the honour to look at the clause he had put on the Paper; but if he had, he would find that that clause carried out the principle in view directly, instead of indirectly, as this clause did. He thought it would be better to leave out the clause altogether, and frame a new one which directly asserted the principle, and made unfitness, as this clause did not, a ground for rescinding the contract, rather than for recovering of damages.

Amendment proposed,

> In page 8, line 30, to leave out from the word "Whereas," to the word "that," in line 31.—(*Mr. Horace Davey.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. HOPWOOD said, his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Horace Davey) had made some very pertinent remarks upon this clause; and he thought the Home Secretary would do well to agree to the Amendment. The Preamble added no strength at all to the clause. He presumed the intention of Parliament was that a house must be structurally defective before this clause could be put in force. It was not intended that the clause should apply because a house was small, or had a slate off; but that it was in such a condition as to be likely to breed disease amongst those who occupied it, especially from unseen and unknown causes. Would it not be well that the clause should read something in this way—

> "Wherever the Sanitary Authority or inmates discovered there was something structurally wrong they should have the right of action, if necessary, against the landlord in order to remedy it."

If that was the idea of the right hon. Gentleman it could be shown in very simple terms, and without disturbing the law of the land.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he was not responsible for the drafting of this clause, and he had no objection to the Preamble being struck out; but he could not consent to the whole of the clause being struck out. The Bill had been before the House for some time, and he thanked the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Christchurch (Mr. Horace Davey) for having been the only Member who had ventured to improve the Bill by drawing up a new clause in substitution of one he proposed to omit. If other hon. Members had done the same, greater progress might have been made with the measure. He himself had thought there were certain modifications of this clause necessary. He did not himself object to applying the principle of the clause to all houses; but he thought that in this particular Bill it was better to confine themselves to small houses. Then the clause might be so modified as to provide that in any contract made after the passing of the Act, for the letting for habitation by the working classes of any house, there should be an implied condition that the house, at such time of letting, was in all respects reasonably fit for human habitation. The clause would then run—

> "In any contract made after the passing of this Act for letting for habitation by persons of the working classes a house or part of a house, there shall be implied a condition that at the time of letting the house is an all respects reasonably fit for such human habitation."

He had no objection to accept the clause as he had modified it, striking out, as proposed, the Preamble.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the words from "that," in line 31, to "that," in line 33, be left out of the Clause," put, and *agreed to.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) proposed to insert, after "contract," in page 8, line 34, "made after the passing of this Act."

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. HORACE DAVEY suggested it would be better to say "in any lease or contract for letting."

MR. STAVELEY HILL thought it would be sufficient to say "in any demise of a furnished or unfurnished house."

Amendment *agreed to.*

On Motion of The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) the following Amendments made:—Page 8, line 34, after "habitation," insert "by persons of the working classes;" line 34, leave out "an unfurnished," insert "a;" line 35, leave out "an unfurnished," insert "a."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) suggested that after "is," in line 36, the words "at the date of the contract" be inserted.

SIR SYDNEY WATERLOW thought it would be better to say "at the time of the letting."

SIR HENRY JAMES was of opinion that the words used should be "at the commencement of the holding."

Question, "That the words 'at the commencement of the holding' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. STOREY thought it would be as well to strike out the rest of the clause. He did not know what "reasonably" meant.

SIR HENRY JAMES wished to point out what was merely a clerical error. The word "is" ought to be "shall be."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, that "reasonably fit for human habitation" seemed to him to be the proper words.

THE CHAIRMAN said, the Amendment now before the Committee was to leave out the word "such."

Question, "That the word 'such' stand part of the Clause," put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the word 'human' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. JESSE COLLINGS said, that after the word "habitation" he would like to put the following Amendment:—

"Provided the term 'reasonably fit for human habitation' shall be held to include a sufficient and convenient supply of water to the house in respect of which the water rates have to be paid by the landlord."

He moved that because the condition of drains would have to be considered in the matter of whether it was fit for habitation, and without a supply of water it could not be. They knew that if there was one thing they found more often than another, in regard to labourers' dwellings, it was the absence of a supply of water; and he thought that a clause such as this to compel owners of property to give a good supply of water would tend more than anything else towards healthy habitations.

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE considered that the object which the hon. Member had in view was fully carried out by the clause as it stood at present.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS said, that if it was the opinion of the right hon. Gentleman that the words of the clause did cover this point, then he was satisfied.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, that, having got down so far, he thought they might leave out the rest of the clause for the purpose of putting in these words, which were on the Notice Paper—

"In this section the expression 'letting for habitation by members of the working classes' means the letting for habitation of a house or part of a house at a rent not exceeding in England the sum named as the limit for the composition of rates by section three of 'The Poor Rate Assessment or Collection Act, 1869,' and in Ireland four pounds."

Therefore, he moved to leave out to the end of the clause.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

SIR ROBERT FOWLER (LORD MAYOR) said, he had undertaken to move an Amendment for the hon. Member for Mid Surrey (Sir Whittaker Ellis); but as those words were to be struck out there was no necessity for him to move it.

MR. ONSLOW remarked that the Home Secretary had said that this was a Bill for the purely working classes. If that were so, there could be no harm whatever in letting these words remain in the clause.

MR. HORACE DAVEY said, the reason for leaving them out was because they did not determine the remedy. They did not say that the tenant should terminate the demise, or do anything else.

MR. STAVELEY HILL did not think it mattered very much, because he thought that any tenant who found himself in that position would very soon terminate the demise.

Amendment *agreed to.*

SIR SYDNEY WATERLOW said, he would like the right hon. Gentleman to tell them why he had not put in the words "twenty pounds." They had put in "four pounds" in the case of Ireland, but they had not put in the exact amount in regard to England. Unless the right hon. Gentleman had some good reason for not doing so, he thought they should put in "twenty pounds." There was no reason why they should be compelled to go to another Act of Parliament to see what the amount was.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, that he wished to show where the proposal came from; and, therefore, he had inserted the words as they were in the Amendment.

MR. INCE did not see why they could not put in the actual amount. There was nothing so needlessly inconvenient to practitioners as the practice of sending them from statute to statute in order to ascertain the real effect of an enactment.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) thought that after the words "Act, 1869," they might insert the words "namely, twenty pounds."

Amendment proposed, to insert after "1869" the words "namely, twenty pounds."

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

LORD BURGHLEY did not think that his Amendment was wanted now.

Supplemental.

Clause 14 (Definitions).

On Motion of The SECRETARY of STATE (Sir R. Assheton Cross) the following Amendment made:—Page 9, line 8, after "authority," insert "and contributory place."

MR. JESSE COLLINGS said, he had an Amendment in line 14. He begged to move to leave out the words "half an" and insert "one." The object of the Amendment was to provide that the expression "cottage" might include a garden of "one" acre instead of "half an" acre. He laid great stress upon that, because it would make all the difference to those people whom it was intended to benefit, and who might do much better if they had an additional half acre. They might do better with one acre; but as the clause now stood they would not be able to have more than half an acre.

Amendment proposed, in page 9, line 14, to leave out the words "half an," and insert the word "one,"—(*Mr. Jesse Collings,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE thought there was something to say in favour of the views of his hon. Friend upon the strength of the evidence that was taken before the Royal Commission; but still, under the circumstances under which the half acre was arrived at by the Commission as a compromise, he felt precluded from supporting the Amendment.

MR. BROADHURST hoped the Committee would not listen to the compromise, and would accept the Amendment. What they wanted to do was to keep the people in the rural districts rather than let them gradually flock into the small towns, and that would be best done by allowing them to have industrial dwellings on these small plots of land. The Amendment struck at the root of the evil, because it proposed to keep a great number of people out of the towns; and, therefore, they would not be obliged to provide for them in the cities by legislation hereafter.

MR. ARTHUR ARNOLD considered that, as a matter of economic cultivation, a cottager would be better able to pursue husbandry if he had one acre than if he had half-an-acre; and, therefore, he thought the Amendment should be accepted.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) said, that no man could support himself on one acre.

MR. BROADHURST remarked that it would go a long way.

THE PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) said, that evidence showed that even five acres could not support a man who had no other work. It ought to be borne in mind also that what they were asked to give was to be paid for out of the rates; and for those reasons he thought the compromise, which had not been arrived at without very careful consideration, should be accepted.

MR. BROADHURST stated that within a short time he had been on a plot of land of less than two acres, the rent of which was £12 a-year, although it was situated next to land which was only fetching £1 5*s.* an acre. Although it had no pig-sties attached, on this small plot of land—without pigs—a man was earning a very good living, with the assistance of a little filling up in the winter months.

MR. STAVELEY HILL thought that half-an-acre was the proper figure. He had a great deal of experience, and he knew that a man could not cultivate more than half-an-acre.

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT did not believe that a man could cultivate one acre sufficiently to keep himself, if he had other work, unless he had the assistance of sons or other relatives. He was willing to give those people everything that they could give them; but he was certain that they could not work more than half-an-acre.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS said, it was very amusing to hear hon. Members opposite say what they would be very glad to give these people; but that was not the question at all. It was not the question whether they should be compelled to have an acre, but whether they should have the option of having it. There were many cases in which the possession of one acre would be worth twice or three times as much as half-an-acre, because the man had labour to work it. The President of the Local Government Board had talked about this land being given out of the rates; but he did not understand that they were going to give this to the man. The man would have to pay for what he had. The only question was whether the principle of compulsory acquisition which this Bill contained should be extended from half-an-acre to an acre. He attached great value to the alteration, and should divide the Committee on it.

MR. STOREY said, his sympathies were with his hon. Friend below him, but his judgment was against him. This was not a Bill for providing allotments.

MR. BROADHURST: It is.

MR. STOREY: It is not.

MR. BROADHURST: It is.

MR. STOREY said, it was a Bill for providing decent habitations for working people, and to it there had been added this proposal that the labouring men should also have half-an-acre of land. He did not object to that at all; but he would ask hon. Gentlemen just to remember this—that they must take some account of the means of these poor men. The cottages which were to be built out of the rates would not be built more cheaply than other cottages; these people would have to pay rent for them, and if they had more land given they would have more rent to pay. He thought the Committee ought to be content with the original proposal of the Bill.

MR. BROADHURST said, he did not wish to have an unintentional, no doubt, though a very false interpretation given to his statement by the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for West Sussex (Sir Walter B. Barttelot). What he had stated was that for a plot of land of less than two acres the labourers were paying £12 a-year ground rent, whilst farmers in adjoining fields were paying 25*s.* per acre or less, and that even under these circumstances the labourers did very well, being able to employ themselves profitably during bad times of the year. He had not said that these labourers were making large profits and keeping their families comfortably. He knew an experienced labourer who had stated to him that although his rent was extremely high, if he were permitted to build a pig-sty and erect a stable for a pony the rent would be reasonable, and he would be able to make a good living without additional employment. This man lived three miles from any city or town. With regard to the statement of the hon. Member for Sunderland (Mr. Storey) that this was not a Bill for providing allotments, he wished to point out that the measure certainly had that object. Allotments were at the root of the question of the housing of the working classes in the rural districts, as it had been proved before the Royal Commission over and over again, by most competent witnesses—from the Earl of Shaftesbury downwards. It was proved that where good allotments were attached to cottages, the labourers could much better afford to pay a large rent than they could afford to pay a small one where there were no allotments attached. Therefore, he contended that his hon. Friend was quite within the four corners of the Bill—indeed, that he was improving the Bill in the direction in which the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary had admitted it could be made of much value. There was no doubt whatever that this Committee would be doing the wisest possible thing in accepting the Amendment of his hon. Friend, inasmuch as the provision would not be compulsory.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS said, he would point out to hon. Members who had not read the evidence that nearly the whole—at any rate, he might say for safety, two-thirds—of the rural evidence was taken up with the proofs of the advantages of these allotments not only on the part of the labourers, but also on the part of such men as the Rev. Mr. Stubbs and other clergymen, who had stated that allotments alone would solve the question of rent—that though it was practically impossible for these labourers to pay anything like a large rent for their cottages, yet it was easy for them to pay a higher rent for a cottage with an allotment attached to it. If the hon. Gentleman the Member for Sunderland (Mr. Storey) had read the evidence, he would have avoided falling into two blunders — namely, one in supposing that this Bill was not a Bill for allotments, and the other in believing that labourers would think themselves well-off with half-an-acre of land. He (Mr. Jesse Collings) thought the labourers would be very much disappointed if they got no more than half-an-acre. As to the compromise which his hon. Friend said had been arrived at, the division had been taken at a time when it was not expected to come on. There had been a misunderstanding in the matter, and some Gentlemen had not been present. Some who were not present would undoubtedly have objected to the compromise if they had been present. He mentioned that to show that the compromise was, at all events, not universal. He would recommend that they should not say in the clause that a labourer should be obliged to have half-an-acre, but that he might be allowed to take "not more than an acre."

SIR SYDNEY WATERLOW said, he agreed with the proposed Amendment. Where a man was in constant work he could not cultivate more than one-eighth of an acre; but there were large numbers of working men, such as plumbers and painters, who had not constant employment all the year round, or who had to job about the country and did not get continuous work. To such men these allotments would be invaluable in enabling them to make use of time which would otherwise be lost. He thought they ought to meet the wishes of these people. He had had 44 men at a time each holding an eighth of an acre. When a man was in constant work he would take an eighth. Some would take a quarter; but when a man had really precarious work he wanted a larger plot of land to enable him to cultivate it with advantage. The men who worked upon plots of land in this way were amongst the most deserving men in the country.

MR. STAVELEY HILL said, the hon. Baronet who had just sat down seemed to have forgotten that each of these men of whom he spoke believed each year that he was going to have constant work; and, no doubt, the hon. Baronet's experience would bear out his—that when work was least slack workmen took gardens most readily. It was when they had plenty of work that they entered upon gardening with the most zeal.

SIR SYDNEY WATERLOW said, that he could not agree with his hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Staveley Hill).

Question put.

The Committee *divided:*—Ayes 51; Noes 16: Majority 35.—(Div. List, No. 287.)

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT said, he should like to ask the right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary why he kept in the Proviso at the end of the clause—

> "Provided that the estimated annual value of such garden shall not exceed one pound?"

They had just heard from an hon. Member that a labourer might have to pay £6 for an acre, or £12 for two acres. It seemed to him that it would be only reasonable to take that Proviso out of the clause.

MR. JESSE COLLINGS said, the point suggested by the hon. and gallant Baronet was a very important one. If the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer would go down into——

THE CHAIRMAN: Does the hon. and gallant Baronet move anything?

SIR WALTER B. BARTTELOT: Yes; I move to strike out the word "one."

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. and gallant Baronet cannot amend the clause. The Question is, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

MR. JESSE COLLINGS said, he thought the hon. and gallant Baronet was in Order.

THE CHAIRMAN: No; the Question has been put that Clause 14 stand part of the Bill. The hon. and gallant Baronet can move the Amendment on Report.

Question, "That the Clause, as amended, stand part of the Bill," put, and *agreed to.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): We now come to the Amendments to Clause 6 which were postponed.

MR. DAWSON said, he begged to move the first Amendment standing in the name of the hon. Gentleman the Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray), the object of which was to make the rates of interest charged in this Bill retrospective. There were a great many people in Ireland to whom this clause ought to apply who had borrowed money, but had not yet drawn the whole of it, and who had drawn money, but had not yet returned it. If this Amendment were not adopted many Artizans' Dwellings Companies would be placed at a great disadvantage, for they might have borrowed money at 3½ or 4 per cent. No reference in the clause was made to the Acts of 1879 and 1881 which affected Ireland, and under which money had been borrowed at 3½ and 4 per cent. The favourable clauses for borrowing money in the present Bill should be extended to these Acts, and to money borrowed and not yet returned, and money granted and not yet taken. The right hon. Gentleman the Home Secretary would see that this was a fair demand to make, particularly when they bore in mind what a hard struggle it was for many existing Artizans' Dwellings Companies to continue their laudable work.

Amendment proposed,

In Clause 6, page 5, line 32, after the word "advanced," to insert the words "or to be advanced."—(*Mr. Dawson.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER said, he could not agree to the Amendment. It appeared to be an attempt to upset bargains already entered into in order that a lower interest might be paid for borrowed money. That was a retrospective principle that he could not accept. When he had been asked whether or not it was intended to make this clause retrospective, he had replied that it was not so intended. He hoped the hon. Member would not press the proposal.

Amendment *negatived.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS): I now move my new clause with reference to the application of the Act to Ireland—

"In the application of this Act to Ireland, the following provisions shall take effect:—

"(1.) 'The Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1878,' shall be substituted for 'The Public Health Act, 1875,' and in particular the references in this Act to sections ten, ninety, ninety-one, and one hundred and seventy-five to one hundred and seventy-eight, both inclusive, of 'The Public Health Act, 1875,' shall be respectively taken to be references to sections eight, one hundred, one hundred and seven, and two hundred and two to two hundred and four, both inclusive, of 'The Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1878,' and the reference to sections two hundred and ninety-three to two hundred and ninety-six, both inclusive, of "The Public Health Act, 1875,' shall be taken to be a reference to sections two hundred and nine, two hundred and ten, two hundred and twelve, and two hundred and thirteen of 'The Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1878;'

"(2.) The provisions of this Act which relate exclusively to the adoption by rural sanitary authorities of the Labouring Classes Lodging Houses Acts, 1851 to 1867, shall not apply to Ireland;

"(3.) The Local Government Board for Ireland shall be substituted for the Local Government Board;

"(4.) The Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland shall be substituted for the Public Works Loan Commissioners;

"(5.) This Act, so far as it amends 'The Labouring Classes Lodging Houses and Dwellings (Ireland) Act, 1866,' shall be construed with that Act, and that Act shall be included amongst the Labouring Classes Lodging Houses Acts, 1851 to 1867, as they are referred to under that description in this Act. So much of subsection four of section twenty-one of the said Act of 1866 as provides that no bye-laws made under that Act shall be of any legal force until the same shall have received the approval of the Chief Secretary or Under Secretary for Ireland, shall be amended by substituting therein the Local Government Board for Ireland in lieu of the Chief or Under Secretary;

"(6.) Nothing contained in this Act shall prevent the adoption by any town commissioners, not being an urban sanitary authority, or by any such company, society, association, or private persons as are therein referred to, of 'The Labouring Classes Lodging Houses and Dwellings (Ireland) Act, 1866, by whom that Act might have been adopted if this Act had not been passed."

New Clause (Application of Act to Ireland,)—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Clause read a second time, and *added* to the Bill.

MR. DAWSON said, that, in the absence of his hon. Friend the Member for Carlow (Mr. Gray), he begged to move the following new Clauses:—

"It shall not be lawful for any private dwelling house constructed for the use of a single family, and so occupied or last occupied at the time of the passing of this Act, to be occupied by more than one family, without a certificate from the sanitary authority of the district that due provision has been made in such house for the separation of the sexes, for suitable sanitary accommodation, and for sufficient light and air; and such certificate shall state the number of rooms in every such house permitted to be occupied, the number of cubic feet in each room, and the number of persons who may occupy each room.

"It shall not be lawful for any building constructed as a coach-house, out-house, or stable, and occupied or last occupied as such at the time of the passing of this Act, to be occupied by any family, unless under the regulations laid down in the foregoing section.

He wished to explain that in some towns in Ireland there were large houses which had been turned into tenement houses, having, years ago, been occupied by the better classes. This was especially the case in Dublin, Limerick, and Cork. He maintained that these clauses were necessary, under the circumstances, in order to see that the people did not go into houses which were inadequate for comfort and decency and sanitary purposes. He wished to prevent tenement houses of the kind he had mentioned being re-let without its being shown that they possessed proper sanitary conditions as to cubic space, light, ventilation, air, &c. A great deal of money had been lost in building new houses when available houses were at hand—houses which, with a little expense, could be made extremely valuable for artizans' dwellings. The clause would operate in such cases. He did not mean it to be retrospective; but he desired that in the future no houses of this character should be let as tenement houses without a certificate from the Sanitary Authority that they had been made habitable. With regard to the second part of the proposal, it was common in Ireland to let coach-houses and stables as dwelling-houses, and they were very often let in a very unsanitary condition. He thought none of those places should be so let until a certificate had been obtained.

New Clause (Occupation of tenement houses,)—(*Mr. Dawson,*)—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE thought that everything the hon. Gentleman wished to be done could be done by the present law. There were tenement regulations under the present law which provided for what the hon. Gentleman wished. In regard to towns where there were no tenement regulations, all that was necessary was that the Local Authorities should adopt the regulations. The Commission did not receive any evidence in Ireland in respect to the point raised by the last four lines of the hon. Gentleman's clause.

MR. DAWSON said, that what his hon. Friend (Mr. Gray) wanted to secure was that a house should not be occupied by more than one family until it had been certified as having complied with certain and proper regulations.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) thought the last four lines of the clause should come in a Public Health Bill.

Question put, and *negatived*.

MR. MONCKTON said, the Amendment which stood in his name provided that the appointment and removal of the Sanitary Inspector should be subject to the approval of the Local Government Board. It was very desirable, considering the important functions this officer would have to exercise under this Bill, that there should be some guarantee of his fitness for the post he was to occupy. If the appointment was subject to the approval of the Local Government Board, they would have, at least, an additional guarantee that the officer was qualified to discharge the duties required of him. He thought it was also very desirable, as he stated yesterday on the second reading of the Bill, that this officer should be altogether independent of the Local Authority, and free from the consequences of interfering with any property belonging to the Local Authority. He should be extremely glad if the Government could see their way to accept his clause.

New Clause—

(Appointment of Inspector.)

"The appointment and removal of the Sanitary Inspector charged with the execution of any of the provisions of this Act shall be subject to the approval of the Local Government Board,"—(*Mr. Monckton,*)

—*brought up*, and read the first time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Clause be read a second time."

THE PRESIDENT OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD (Mr. A. J. BALFOUR) said, that at present in districts outside the Metropolis, where the Government paid part of the salaries of Inspectors, there was control over the appointments. In the Metropolis, however, no such control existed; but then there was no subvention from the public funds. Without such subvention it would be manifestly wrong to insist upon control. He thought, however, that the object his hon. Friend had in view could be met by the Consolidated Bill for London.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Schedule.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) proposed to leave out from "repealed," in page 10, line 2, to end of line.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Other Amendments made.

Schedules, as amended, *agreed to.*

Bill *reported*, with Amendments; as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

LAND PURCHASE (IRELAND) BILL.

[*Lords.*]—[BILL 249.]

(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

CONSIDERATION.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

COLONEL NOLAN proposed the following new Clause:—

"Any owner may enter into an agreement with one or more of his tenants to let to him or them a portion or the whole of any grass or mountain farm conditionally on the Land Commissioners approving of the sale of such land to such tenant or tenants; and, should the Commissioners approve of this agreement, the tenant or tenants will be considered the occupying tenants of such land for the purposes of this Act: Provided, That such portion does not exceed thirty acres of grass or fifty acres of mountain land for any one tenant.

"The Commissioners may make rules to enable tenants to be treated as the occupying tenants of a grass or mountain farm which the landlord may wish to sell to them."

The hon. and gallant Gentleman said, he had modified the Amendment since last night by restricting its operation, and he hoped that in its present shape the Government would be able to accept it. The operation of the clause could not be considered injurious to any proprietor, because it simply amounted to this—that when land was being sold the tenants on it could buy a small bit of land which was not in their own occupation. The want of a few acres of grass land was very keenly felt by the people of Galway and Mayo, and it was on their behalf he proposed this clause.

New Clause (Purchase of grass farms) —(*Colonel Nolan,*)—*brought up*, and read the first and second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the said Clause be added to the Bill."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, by this Bill it was proposed to make advances to tenants to enable them to purchase their holdings. By this clause, however, it was suggested that persons should receive money for the purpose of purchasing grass land which they did not occupy. Such a suggestion was entirely outside the scope of the Bill, and therefore could not be accepted.

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, it appeared to him that the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland was, to say the least of it, straining the matter very severely when he argued that the suggestion was outside the purview of the Bill. He (Colonel King-Harman) maintained that it was not. He would, however, very much prefer the Amendment which he had put on the Paper to that of the hon. and gallant Member for Galway (Colonel Nolan). He was quite persuaded that a landlord might be quite ready to sell a small portion of good land adjoining the tenant's holding, or it might be a portion of bog land from which the tenant could obtain a supply of fuel, a commodity which was not very valuable to the landlord, but of great value to the tenant; besides, in course of time the tenant might make the bog land itself valuable. He really could not see any objection to the clause. He knew that when his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Nolan) brought the clause up on a previous occasion there was an idea that it meant the breaking up of grass land. His impression was that, so far from that being the case, the operation of the clause would very much improve grass lands. He knew, and everybody must know, that a few acres of grass land would make everything to a tenant whose holding now was scarcely big enough for him to live upon.

Mr. SEXTON thought that this was strictly a matter which could be dealt with by the Bill. If they stuck strictly by legal ideas in carrying out this Bill, what would happen? The tenants would only get agricultural holdings; and without the grazing rights they had hitherto had their holdings would be of very little use to them. He thought his hon. and gallant Friend (Colonel Nolan) would do well to withdraw his Amendment in favour of that of the hon. and gallant Member for Dublin County (Colonel King-Harman), which appeared to be very terse and clear, and to meet the necessities of the case; because if a landlord and tenant combined together in this matter, no doubt it would have an effect on the Land Commission, who would be more inclined thereby to take the question into consideration.

Mr. O'SHEA appealed to the Government to accept the Amendment of the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Dublin County (Colonel King-Harman). There was no doubt that unless this Amendment, or an Amendment in the same sense was accepted, a great deal of land that ought to be sold, and would otherwise be sold, would be absolutely unsaleable. The hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Galway (Colonel Nolan) had spoken about Mayo and Galway. He (Mr. O'Shea) could also speak about Mayo. He knew many properties in that county on which it would be very difficult indeed to make arrangements with tenants unless they could arrange with regard to grass land. In County Clare there were a great many properties on which it would be even more difficult than on those in Mayo to make sales unless some such Amendment as that under consideration was accepted. He had got some land in County Clare which it would be impossible to sell unless he could cut up the mountain grazing and bog amongst his tenants. With the exception of two or three, it would not be worth the while of the tenants unless they could buy mountain land for grazing purposes in the portions they required. He did not think the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) had placed himself in a position to speak as strongly as he had done on this subject. If the right hon. and learned Gentleman had had time to take the opinion of many of those he represented he would have found them as strong in favour of an Amendment like that of the hon. and gallant Gentleman opposite (Colonel King-Harman) as the hon. and gallant Gentleman was himself. Unless the Government accepted the Amendment they would find that in a great many instances—in more instances than they imagined—the Bill would be absolutely inoperative.

Sir WALTER B. BARTTELOT thought this question was one that came well within the scope of the Bill, and one which the Government ought to accept if they wanted the Bill to be workable.

Mr. HEALY took a similar view. He would make an appeal to the right hon. and learned Gentleman whether it was really worth while keeping up this discussion? When there was so much agreement on all sides of the House on this point, it was a shame that they should be put off with a mere technical objection by the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes). They were meeting the Government in an exceedingly fair manner, because there were many points that the Irish Members would like to discuss if it were not for the late period of the Session. The Government must confess that they had given them very much indulgence in order to enable them to go on with the Bill; and he hoped, therefore, that they would gracefully accept this Amendment.

THE FIRST COMMISSIONER OF WORKS (Mr. PLUNKET) said, his right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland, who could not speak again, had asked him to express on his behalf his very great regret that he could not accept this Amendment. It had been very carefully considered not only by his right hon. and learned Friend, but also by Lord Ashbourne, who had originally considered this Bill. His right hon. and learned Friend would have been very glad if he could have accepted it. What he felt, and the ground upon which his objection rested, was this—that the Amendment would be a departure from the principle of the Bill, which was to advance money to the actual tenant of a holding. This was a proposal to advance money to a person who was not the actual tenant of the holding. If the landlord wanted to see to these people he could easily do so. It was not through unwillingness that they could not accept the Amendment, but because they had very carefully considered it, and found that they could not approve of the scheme it involved.

MR. MOLLOY said, he did not consider that a single reason had been advanced for not accepting the Amendment. Lord Ashbourne might have considered the matter; but then all the Irish Members in that House without dissent agreed that it was not only a useful, but a necessary clause. Let him take the case of his district. The refusal to accept this Amendment would take nine-tenths of the land of King's County out of the operation of the Bill. It was nearly all bog, which was not included in this Bill, and the tenants could not take advantage of the Bill, because if they did they would have to give up their right to cut bog. While the Government declared that this Bill was brought in on behalf of the landlord and tenant equally—although they might have different opinions on that subject—they absolutely refused to pass a clause which would enable them to agree. The result of this would be that this Bill would be of no use to the tenants in his county. They would not give up the right to cut bog, and, therefore, the Government were depriving the people they said they desired to improve of the whole benefits of the Bill. Let them look back for a minute to former legislation on this and kindred subjects. The Irish Members had pressed them over and over again in regard to matters of this sort, but had been persistently refused. What was the result? Why, the result was this—that they were there again after five years to remedy the obvious mistakes that they had made up to this time. Still they refused this Amendment, although nobody could find any reason for refusing. Could they find a single Irish Member in that House who would support them in their refusal? They said that the matter had been considered by Lord Ashbourne and the right hon. and learned Gentleman opposite (the Attorney General for Ireland); but he would ask them if they would put the opinions of those two Gentlemen against the opinions of all the Irish Members? While the Irish Members were doing their best to help them they were still obstinate in their refusal; and all he could say was that, as far as his county was concerned, they were simply cutting the tenants in that county out of all the benefits contained in the Bill.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the said Clause be added to the Bill."

COLONEL KING-HARMAN (speaking seated, with head covered): May I ask the Government whether, if they reject this Amendment, they will accept mine which follows?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. and gallant Member is only entitled to speak at this point upon a point of Order.

The House *divided*:—Ayes 19; Noes 40: Majority 21.—(Div. List, No. 288.)

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, that after the determined opposition of the

Government he would not move his Amendment.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES), in moving, as an Amendment, in page 1, line 22, after "1881," to leave out to the end of the sub-section, said, the object of it was this—the sum of £2,000 was inserted in the Bill in Committee, subject to the consideration of the Government, who were to look into the matter. They found that, in the last Act, the sum fixed was £3,000, with power to the Commissioners to raise it to £5,000, if they thought fit. Her Majesty's Government now thought it would be better to alter the sum to what it was in the old Act.

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 22, to leave out from "1881," to end of Sub-section (*a*).—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the said sub-section."

MR. SEXTON said, he wished to point out that the sum of £3,000 would enable the Commissioners to advance money for the purchase of holdings, the rents of which were £150; but if they put it at £5,000 they would make it possible to advance money for the purchase of holdings at rents of £250 per annum. He hardly thought that the Bill was intended for such large tenants as that, and he thought that even the Land Commissioners ought hardly to have the power of advancing money in such cases. He would not press his suggestion to a division; but he recommended it to the consideration of the right hon. and learned Gentleman.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he was willing to accept the suggestion of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton).

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment proposed, in page 1, lines 23 and 24, to leave out the words "two thousand pounds."—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

Question, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause," put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That the words 'three thousand pounds' be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. HEALY moved, in page 1, line 24, at the end of the foregoing Amendment, to insert the words—

> "And provided that if the landlord agrees to sell to any person who has been evicted on his estate the word 'tenants' in this section shall include any such person."

There was no greater eyesore in the country at the present time than the number of tenants who had been evicted, and they were the cause of all the mischief which took place, and for that reason he moved his Amendment. If the Government would consent to accept it, they would do away with a great deal of the trouble which existed. It would put an end to a great deal of the distress of the people, to the shooting of caretakers, to the houghing of cattle, and to all those evils which had been a running sore throughout the country for years.

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) regretted that this was an Amendment to which he must object. The principle of the Bill was to deal with existing tenants, and an evicted tenant was not a tenant. It was already possible for the landlord to reinstate a tenant in the possession of his farm, in order to deal with him under this Bill; and, therefore, this Amendment was unnecessary.

MR. O'SHEA pointed out that the reinstatement of the tenant by the landlord would be a very roundabout way of dealing with the matter. Suppose, moreover, the landlord reinstated an evicted tenant, and the sale was not effected, he would still be a tenant, and could appeal to the Court for the purchase.

MR. SEXTON recognized that the Government had made a good start by attempting to govern Ireland with the ordinary law, and they would see what would happen during the coming winter. He should have thought, however, that they would have done well by accepting this Amendment, which would have removed one of the most perilous elements in the country during the winter. Seeing that they had replaced coercion with the ordinary law they would have done a wise thing to have made this concession.

Colonel KING-HARMAN was bound to say that he should oppose this Amendment. It seemed to him to be an absurd thing to say that the State should trust a man whose only claim to be trusted was that he had not paid his rent, and had been very properly evicted in consequence. It would raise a very bad feeling indeed amongst the honest tenants if they saw these people put in as State tenants on as good terms as they themselves obtained.

Mr. DAWSON thought the Government should put in this Amendment as an intimation to the landlords, who had so much to do with the government of Ireland, that they had commenced a new era in the administration of that country. If they desired the success of their Bill they certainly would insert it, and he had no doubt they would eventually have to thank the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy) for having suggested it. The hon. and learned Member had put his mark on another Act, and if his suggestions had been more fully carried out they would not be in the position they were in now. If they put a "Healy Clause" in this Bill they would probably make it a success.

Mr. P. J. POWER merely rose to corroborate what had fallen from his hon. Friends. He thought that if a good many of these people had the power of appealing to the Courts they would be able to prove that they were evicted for the non-payment of impossible rents. They ought to accept the Amendment. There were many difficulties in the way of carrying out the suggestion of the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland, because if once reinstated the tenant might double on the landlord, and place him in a very false position. As another hon. Member had pointed out also, it was in the interest of peace during the coming winter that they asked for this proposal to be accepted.

Sir JOSEPH M'KENNA really thought the Government ought to accept this Amendment. If the landlord had to replace the evicted tenant in the position of an existing tenant before he could deal with him he would be placing himself in a very false position, because the Land Court might not, after all, allow the purchase money. It would be a very hard thing, under those circumstances, that they should saddle the landlord with a tenant whom he had previously had to evict.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER hoped that hon. Members would not prolong this discussion. It was now 3 o'clock in the morning——

Mr. HEALY: We did not begin until 2. We were waiting all that time.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that if hon. Members wished to persevere with the proposal he would be perfectly willing to adjourn the debate; but in that case the Bill would have to take its chance. All these points had been raised in Committee——

Mr. HEALY: Never before; never mentioned before.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that at all events a great many things had been discussed in Committee, and had been then decided. His right hon. and learned Friend the Attorney General for Ireland had prepared Amendments to meet all the points that were then raised, and was ready to move them; but if new Amendments were to be raised it appeared to him that they would never finish the discussion of the Bill. He would make an appeal to hon. Members in the most friendly spirit to conclude this debate, which he thought had been very inconveniently prolonged for all of them.

Mr. MOLLOY said, the remarks of the Chancellor of the Exchequer were not quite fair to Irish Members. They had waited through the night until the Bill was reached, and when the right hon. Gentleman complained of new Amendments he should remember that they now heard the Government Amendments for the first time, and had at once to weigh and seriously consider them. These Amendments were half promised by the Attorney General for Ireland when the Bill was in Committee; but the right hon. and learned Gentleman had minimized the demands Irish Members made, and the fulfilment of the promises he gave. Certainly on this particular point he agreed they should take a division for their own sakes, to have it on record that they made this offer and it was refused.

Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN said, he was exceedingly sorry the Government had taken up this position. They had the opportunity, in a very simple way, to do a great good and avoid a great evil. What harm could come of the Amendment? Landlords need not treat with their evicted tenants unless they chose; there was no compulsion; it was only giving them the chance of doing so. The hon. and gallant Member for Dublin County (Colonel King-Harman) said if this were done it would be putting on a level men who had paid their honest debts and those who had not. That amounted to a statement that all the evicted tenants were dishonest men who refused to pay their just debts; but that was a statement he altogether denied. Collectively those tenants were as honest as any in the land; but they failed to pay exorbitant rack-rents — dishonest claims, though legally exacted—and so they were evicted from their holdings. In this lay an evil and danger to society in Ireland, and he was surprised that the Government had not grasped this mode of dealing with it harmlessly, without injury to any class in the country. He hoped it was not too late to appeal to the Government to reconsider their determination. No class could reasonably object if the Government seized this opportunity to settle a great difficulty. The more he thought of it, the better and simpler the proposal seemed. Upon the Government must rest the responsibility of needlessly refusing a simple proposition which, if accepted, would produce excellent effects in Ireland from every possible point of view.

Question put.

The House *divided:*—Ayes 11; Noes 45: Majority 34.—(Div. List, No. 289.)

Clause 3 (Deposit of money as guarantee fund).

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND the following Amendments made:—In page 2, line 16, leave out from "until," to "and," and insert—

"They ascertain by order declaring that the person applying for the advance has paid to the Commissioners a sum equal to the guarantee deposit."

Line 24, after "yet," insert—

"Such order shall not be made unless the Land Commission have exercised any power for the sale of the holding which they may legally exercise, and have failed to realise by such sale such sums due to them, or unless it appears that they attempted to exercise such powers of sale and were unable to do so."

Line 25, after "Commission," insert "thereupon."

Clause 5 (Purchase of estates and holdings).

Amendment proposed,

In line 37, after "thereof," insert—"Provided such purchase of estate shall only be made if the Land Commission are reasonably satisfied that four-fifths of the value of the holdings will be purchased. This provision may be relaxed on special grounds with the consent of the Treasury, but only when the Land Commission are reasonably satisfied that holdings of not less than three-fourths in value will be purchased."—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SEXTON said, the argument of the previous night was that a small number of tenants might coerce the majority of tenants, who, from one cause or another, were unwilling to enter into negotiations for purchase; and if the Land Commission could induce four-fifths in value of the tenants to buy them, the remainder would have to submit to the transfer of the power over them from one landlord to another. The advent of a new landlord was a thing Irish tenants did not regard with any confidence. Could the right hon. and learned Gentleman suggest any qualifying words?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he would agree to making the proportion four-fifths in value and number.

Amendment proposed, to the said proposed Amendment, after "value," insert "and number."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed, after "value," in last line but one, insert "and number."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed,

At end of line 37, to add—"And in every such transaction of the purchase of an estate or holding that the Land Commission shall retain not less than one-fifth of the purchase to satisfy the purposes of the guarantee deposit as defined by section 3 of this Act."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, if the hon. Member would strike out the words "or holding" he had no objection to the remainder.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, to omit the words "or holding."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 7 (Sales of residues).

Amendment proposed, in page 4, line 24, to leave out the words "do not," and insert "cannot."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Vesting order in lieu of conveyance).

Mr. SEXTON said, it was of importance that the Commission should not sell to other than tenants above a certain portion of the estate. Could a Proviso in that direction be inserted?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, it was impossible to do that. It had been already settled in the 5th clause under what conditions the Land Commission could purchase. They could only purchase when satisfied that four-fifths of the tenants were willing to buy, and it was obvious the remaining fifth must be sold in some way.

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General for Ireland the following Amendments made:—Page 5, line 2, after "purchaser," insert "free from all charges if the vesting order so declare;" line 2, to leave out "rights and easements;" line 4, leave out "rights and easements."

Clause 9 (Charges and rights subject to which the sale may be made).

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he proposed to strike out the words "with the assent of the purchaser." The words were inserted by the late Attorney General, and in themselves were unobjectionable; but looking at the matter carefully a lawyer might hold that they might have the effect of injuring the title of the purchaser. That was the only reason; and his attention had been called to it by the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy).

Amendment proposed, in page 5, line 24, after the word "fit," to leave out the words "with the assent of the purchaser."—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. SEXTON said, he was sorry the hon. and learned Gentleman the Member for Derry (Mr. Walker) was not present, because he attached importance to the words, which he held to be a protection for the purchaser against the insertion of certain conditions attaching to the holding.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause 13 (Sales to be for a gross sum. Stamp duty.)

On Motion of Colonel King-Harman the following Amendment made:—Page 8, line 15, after "Act" insert—

> "And shall transmit copies thereupon to the Clerk of the Peace of the county in which the holding is situated for the purpose of local registration."

Clause 15 (Injunction to put purchaser in possession).

Mr. SEXTON said, the clause provided that the Land Commission, having exercised their power as mortgagees over the sale of the holding, should proceed to exercise the functions of a tribunal to the extent of issuing an order to the Sheriff for the purpose of putting the purchaser in possession. Surely that was an excessive concentration of power.

Amendment proposed, in page 8, line 3, to leave out the words "or the Land Commission."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, he hoped the Government would not agree to this Amendment in a hurried manner. He did not see why the Land Commission should not exercise these functions. That the Bill had been drawn with great care was the reason put forward against important and useful Amendments on the previous night.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, it was impossible that the draftsman could observe the consequences of every point. It certainly would be an anomaly that the plaintiff in an action should issue the order, and the clause provided the alternatives of the High Court of Justice and the County Court.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause 16 (Additional members and officers of the Land Commission).

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND the following Amendment made:—Page 9, line 19, leave out "Lord Lieutenant may from time to time by order direct that;" line 21, after "Act," leave out "or such Member or Members of the Land Commission as he thinks fit."

Amendment proposed,

In line 23, to insert:—"Provided, That the Lord Lieutenant may from time to time orde that such additional Members of the Land Commission shall perform such other duties as they would have performed if named in the Statute 'Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881,' as Members of the Land Commission other than Judicial Commissioners." — (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. SEXTON said, this appeared to carry out, so far as it went, the understanding arrived at in Committee that the new Commissioners should help in the work of the old Commissioners; but a litigant should have the power of claiming the assistance of the Judicial Commissioner.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, this was provided later on.

Amendment *agreed to.*

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND the following Amendments made:—Page 9, line 24, leave out from the beginning of the line to "may," and insert "additional Commissioners or either of them;" and in line 26, after "by," leave out "him," and insert "them or either of them."

Line 27, after "Land Commission," insert—

"Notwithstanding anything hereinbefore contained any person interested shall be entitled to require that any question of law arising under this Act shall be heard and determined by a Judicial Commissioner sitting with the said additional Commissioners."

Clause 17 (Officers of Landed Estates Court may be transferred to or serve as officers of the Land Commission).

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND the following Amendments made:—Page 10, line 4, after "Act" insert "to the Land Judges of the Chancery Division of the High Court or;" page 9, line 41, after "the" insert "said," and leave out from "Land Judges" to "may," in line 42.

Clause 18 (Receivership jurisdiction of the Land Judges).

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND the following Amendment made:—Page 10, line 15, after "justice," insert "or any Judge or Judges of the Court of Bankruptcy."

Clause 20 (Rules).

At end, insert—

"The forms and tables shall be settled and the orders adapted by the Land Commission for the purposes of this Act."

Clause 21 (Repeal of provisions inconsistent with this Act).

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND the following Amendment made:—Page 10, line 28, leave out from "so" to "so" in line 34, and insert—

"Notwithstanding anything contained in the 48th section of the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881, to the contrary, any person aggrieved by a decision may, on a question of law or procedure under this Act, appeal to the Court of Appeal in Ireland, and."

Clause 25 (Saving for the Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881. 44 and 45 Vict. c. 49.)

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND the following Amendment made:—Page 12, line 37, leave out the second paragraph.

Clause 26 (Interpretation).

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND the following Amendment made:—Page 13, line 13, at end, add—

"The expression 'tenant' shall include tenants holding under fee farm grant."

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read the third time."—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

Motion *agreed to.* (Queen's *consent* signified).

Bill read the third time, and *passed,* with Amendments.

EDUCATIONAL ENDOWMENTS (IRELAND) BILL [*Lords*]—[BILL 176.]

(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

SECOND READING.

Order for Second Reading read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Bill be now read a second time."—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

MR. SEXTON said, under Clause 4 of this Bill the Lord Lieutenant would have power to appoint three Commissioners for the purposes of the Act; but he thought that would be too small a Board to efficiently discharge the duties to be entrusted to it. The number, he thought, should be increased to five. Power was proposed to the Commissioners under Clause 5 to transfer endowments for elementary education to the management of the Commissioners of National Education, and he took the opportunity of saying he should oppose any such transfer of power. The Commissioners of National Education used the powers they had badly, and no funds available under this Bill should be applied by them. If necessary, let the Board of National Education have an inspecting power; but he believed its existence would be a short one, and soon determined. He should certainly make his objection to this part of the clause in Committee.

MR. LEA said, it was very late, and scarcely worth while to proceed with the second reading of an important Bill. Some of his Friends from the North of Ireland had strong objection to the Bill. Would not the Government defer consideration of the Bill to a time when there would be a better attendance of Members than could be expected at half-past 3?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he was very much surprised at the statement of the hon. Member, that some of his Friends entertained strong objection to the Bill, because he had been assured that the late Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Walker) and other Members from the North of Ireland were strongly in favour of the Bill and anxious to bring it forward. As to what had been said by the hon. Member for Sligo, he had to say that he had placed an Amendment on the Paper for Committee, by which the number of Commissioners would be increased to five, and also an Amendment to the 5th clause omitting the power of transfer to the National Boards.

MR. HEALY said, while offering no opposition to this stage of the Bill, it was right he should express the opinion that the Bill could by no means be accepted as a settlement of the question with which it dealt. Though they might allow the Bill to pass this year, Irish Members thought it right to guard themselves from allowing it to be supposed that they accepted it as a settlement of grievances such as that in connection with the Swords School. It was necessary something should be done to stop such scandals; and in allowing the Bill to pass now he guarded himself against any admission that this was the closing chapter of the controversy. It was not surprising that the position of the Bill should be unknown to the hon. Member for Donegal (Mr. Lea) and his Friends, seeing the way in which they discharged their Parliamentary duties. The Bill had been twice passed by the House of Lords, last Session and this Session, at the instance of the late Government; and of course, had they now been in power, the hon. Member for Donegal would not have ventured an objection to the Bill.

Motion *agreed to.*

Bill read a second time, and *committed* for *To-morrow.*

INFANTS BILL [*Lords.*]—[BILL 157.]

(*Mr. Bryce.*)

COMMITTEE.

MR. ONSLOW said, he did not know who had charge of this Bill, or if any instructions had been given in respect to it?

MR. SPEAKER: To be deferred to to-morrow.

MR. ONSLOW said, that they had been told by the Leader of the House that only Government Bills would be taken on the Wednesday; and as the Bill contained matter for grave discussion he begged to move that it be taken on Friday.

MR. SPEAKER: It is a most unusual course to take in the absence of the Member in charge of the Bill.

MR. ONSLOW said, he would beg leave to point out that a most unusual course was proposed in putting the Bill down for Wednesday after the Leader of the House had said the adjournment would be moved after Government Business was disposed of. This unusual course justified him in taking a course which, though unusual, was in accordance with the Rules of the House.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Committee be deferred till Friday."—(*Mr. Onslow.*)

Motion *agreed to.*

PREVENTION OF CRIMES AMENDMENT BILL—[*Lords.*]—[Bill 93.]

(*Mr. Tomlinson.*)

COMMITTEE. [ADJOURNED DEBATE.]

Order read, for resuming Adjourned Debate on Question [27th July], "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" (for Committee on the Prevention of Crimes Amendment Bill) [*Lords*].

Question again proposed.

Debate *resumed.*

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Construction and short title).

Mr. HEALY moved that Progress be reported.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That the Chairman do report Progress, and ask leave to sit again."—(*Mr. Healy.*)

The UNDER SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) said, there was no opposition to the Bill, and he appealed to the hon. and learned Member to allow it to go through. It merely dealt with summary jurisdiction over minor offences, and the obstruction of the police in the execution of their duty.

Mr. SEXTON said, there ought to be some little more explanation. Police officers in Ireland executed their duty in such a way that it was rather meritorious than otherwise to obstruct them. Did the Bill include Ireland? If it were limited to England he had no objection.

Mr. TOMLINSON said, as an Amendment to the Act, the Bill did, to some extent, apply to Ireland; but he had no objection to exempt Ireland.

Mr. HEALY said, then he had no objection to the Bill, and would withdraw his Motion.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Extension of 34 and 35 Vict. c. 112, s. 12).

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 13, to leave out after "duty," to end of Clause.—(*Mr. Tomlinson.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 14, at end, to add:—"Provided, That in cases to which the said recited Act is extended by this Act, the person convicted shall not be liable to a greater penalty than five pounds, or, in default of payment, to be imprisoned with or without hard labour for a longer term than two months."—(*Mr. Tomlinson.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Remaining Clauses *agreed to.*

New Clause (This Act shall not apply to Ireland,)—(*Mr. Tomlinson,*)—read the first and second time, and *added* to the Bill.

Bill *reported;* as amended, *considered;* read the third time, and *passed*, with Amendments.

RIVER THAMES (No. 2.) BILL.—[Bill 90.]

(*Mr. Story-Maskelyne, Sir Michael Hicks-Beach, Mr. Elton, Mr. Walter James, Mr. Sellar, Mr. Molloy.*)

LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Lords' Amendments *considered.*

Amendment proposed,

After "steam launch," insert "and for the prevention of the pollution of the river by the sewage of any house boat or steam launch."—(*Mr. W. H. Smith.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed,

To add to the Lords Amendment—"Or to give any riparian owner any right as against the public which he did not possess before the passing of this Act to exclude any person from navigating any backwater, channel creek, bay, or water way, whether deemed part of the River Thames, as defined by this Act, or not."—(*Mr. W. H. Smith.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Lords Amendments, as amended, *agreed to.*

House adjourned at twelve minutes before Four o'clock in the morning.

HOUSE OF LORDS,

Wednesday, 12th August, 1885.

EGYPT — SOUDAN EXPEDITION — VOTE OF THANKS TO HER MAJESTY'S MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES.—RESOLUTION.

THE MARQUESS OF SALISBURY, in rising, according to Notice, to move that the Thanks of the House be given to General Lord Wolseley, General Sir Gerald Graham, Lord John Hay, and all the other Officers and Men of the Army and Navy, for the skill, courage, and ability with which they have conducted the operations in the Soudan, said: My Lords, in rising to perform this, to me, agreeable duty, I feel assured that I may call upon your Lordships to render that tribute which you always willingly give to those who have risked much, and have borne much, in circumstances of great emergency in the service of their Queen and country. I believe that there is no honour which Her Majesty's Forces value so much as the thanks of the two Houses of Parliament; and I am sure that there has been no condition, no set of circumstances, in which they have better deserved such a guerdon at your Lordships' hands. And in considering their merits you must keep out of sight altogether the precise results and outcome of the labours which they have gone through and the dangers which they have incurred. Of course, my Lords, this is not the moment at which I should revive any controversial topics, and I only wish to say that you must look upon this fact—that they failed to fulfil the main purpose for which they were sent out through no fault of their own. The prize of success was taken from them, as it were, by an overmastering destiny; by the action of causes, whatever their nature, over which they themselves had no more control than they would have over a tempest or an earthquake; and the duty which they were sent to perform was one of singular difficulty and great danger, and surrounded by circumstances strange to the experience of the British Army, and calling forth some of the greatest qualities which that Army has or could ever display. The generalship displayed by Lord Wolseley in that Campaign along the Nile has won the tribute of many high authorities among the most military nations of Europe; and while the work was going on it was watched with mingled solicitude and admiration by spectators from foreign countries and under every Government; and everybody must have felt that Lord Wolseley displayed singular and unusual qualities in fighting against the strange and unaccustomed difficulties with which he had to contend, and those qualities were more than emulated and seconded by the officers and men under his command. He had to send an Expedition more than 1,400 miles, mainly along a river torn with cataracts, among deserts in which neither food nor water was to be had, and in the face of enemies fighting in their own country, skilled in their own warfare, and animated by that formidable mixture of religious fanaticism and military spirit which the religion of Islam seems alone to have the secret of conferring upon its votaries. This tremendous task he performed in an incredibly short space of time, and, considering what he had to go through, with singularly little loss of life, and with preparations which seldom, if ever, failed in their object. And the men, whether they were forcing their boats up cataracts, or whether they were engaged in the unpleasant and unaccustomed duty of conducting camel convoys across the Desert, or whether they were engaged in fighting with Arabs, whose like they had never met before, showed throughout the peculiar qualities for which British soldiers have always been celebrated. It was a campaign which must have been very trying to the spirit of any army; but it made a special appeal to what may be called especial British qualities. There are many armies which show as much, it may be even greater, fire and impulse in the middle of battle, in the inspiriting charge, in fighting a pitched conflict, when foes are ranged together face to face in the battle field; but there is no army which shows in an equal degree the qualities of patient endurance, of steady discipline, and of determination through long and exhausting and anxious service, to do all, to bear all, to dare all, rather than to fail for an instant to fulfil the extreme demands of military fidelity and duty. This is the peculiar glory of the British Army; and I venture to say that, though the scale of its warfare on this occasion may not have been large, at no time in its history has it shown those merits in a more conspicuous degree. Of the Army on the Coast of the Red Sea the same may be said. As in the case of its sister Army in the Valley of the Nile, the results of the Campaign were small; but the dangers which that force faced were not small, the enemy was by no means contemptible. Probably during the two years in which Lieutenant General Graham led his Forces against the Arabs and Osman Digna, he had to encounter enemies more determined and dangers more serious, perils demanding more from the courage of his troops, than even those which were encountered by Lord Wolseley in the Valley of the Nile. The service done was conspicuous in both Campaigns, and it was shared by all the British officers and men. The Navy, as a Navy, did not take any great share in these transactions; but the naval officers and sailors who were employed displayed their accustomed resource and courage. Probably there is no incident which has taken so much hold of the popular imagination as that of Lord Charles Beresford and his gallant sailors mending their boilers under the fire of the enemy's guns, when they were going up the Nile at the last moment to relieve General Gordon. But this Campaign, in addition to proving once again the gallantry both of our soldiers and sailors, has fortunately shown the great and world-wide resources of the British Empire. It is a remarkable circumstance that it was a Campaign in the land of the Pharaohs in which were gathered together side by side, to fight the hosts of the Mahommedan followers of the False Prophet, Canadian boatmen from the extreme confines of the Dominion of Canada, Indian troops from the hills of Nepaul, and Australian volunteers who came forward in a gallant spirit, in an emergency of the Mother Country, to bear their share of the Imperial burden. It was, in that respect, a splendid sight, and the thanks of the two Houses of Parliament are due quite as much to them as to our own immediate countrymen for the gallantry and determination with which they bore their part in this warfare, and in carrying out the Imperial policy. But the great qualities to which I have referred were not displayed without incurring terrible losses, which we can only now recognize and mourn for and honour with the sympathy and deep admiration which in this country are always called forth by a soldier's death. With regard to Sir Herbert Stewart, it is well known that in him were lost the hopes and promises on which the mind of the British Army was fixed. He was a man who seemed to be destined to become a great General and a great leader of the British Army in the future, and with justice, as in an incredibly short time—I believe in eight years—he passed from a captaincy in the Staff College at Sandhurst to be one of the most conspicuous leaders of this Expedition. He carried with him to the grave the deep attachment and admiration of all who knew him. Not less was the deep affection which accompanied Major General William Earle, who was able to inspire his men to a degree which few Generals have ever surpassed with the intense confidence and daring of his own sanguine disposition; and he fell at last, hardly from the ordinary dangers of war, but from the extreme gallantry, verging on rashness, with which he exposed himself to all the perils and dangers to which the commonest of his soldiers might be exposed. But the great loss of all was the loss of him for whom this Expedition was undertaken—the loss of General Charles Gordon. There is no figure during our generation to which the popular feeling and sympathy were so much attached for some time past as to General Gordon. He united in himself such strange contrasts, such a wonderful mixture of admirable qualities! You see in him the stern professional soldier, devoted to his duty himself, almost reckless in the expenditure of life when that was necessary for the performance of the service to which he was commissioned, hard, apparently, in his resolution in dealing with other men, but much harder in dealing with himself; devoted in all he undertook, and mixing, with the most precise and self-abandoning obedience to the orders of those under whom he served, that high spiritual feeling which ran through his whole life, showing that in every act and every word there was interwoven a religious devotion, an intense sense of the reality of spiritual things which, when it is given to any man, appeals in no common degree to the love, the affection, and the veneration of mankind. He has left a story which none in the future will be able to read without feelings of sorrow and almost of indignation. He has left an example of military courage mixed with religious devotion which, I believe, has done much to ennoble the generation to which he belonged, and which will raise the standard of self-devotion as well as of religious zeal among numbers of those who have followed his career and sorrowed for his fate. My Lords, with such grand examples before us, we must feel that this Campaign, whatever else may be said of it, has not been without results. I believe it has added to the military fame of this country; I believe it has added also to the attachment with which the soldiers regard each other, and with which they are devoted to the service of their country. I believe that it holds up many bright examples which, when the passing circumstances and politics of the day are forgotten, will still be sure to inspire and animate others to do their duty to their country and their Queen.

Lord CARRINGTON: My Lords, in the unavoidable absence of my noble Friend (Earl Granville), I rise, with great respect, to second the Motion of the noble Marquess. It would be unbecoming of me to add a single word to what the noble Marquess has said in praise of our gallant troops, and those words of his will go straight to the heart of every Englishman. In view of the Colonial appointment in which I shall shortly have the honour to be entrusted to serve Her Majesty, the House, I hope, will allow me to refer with extreme pride to the promptitude and patriotic zeal with which the Colony of New South Wales came forward in an emergency to take its part in bearing the burdens of the defence of our Empire.

Moved to resolve,

"1. That the Thanks of this House be given to General Lord Wolseley, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., for the distinguished skill and ability with which he planned and conducted the Expedition of 1884-85 by the Nile to the Soudan;

"2. That the Thanks of this House be given to Lieutenant-General Sir Gerald Graham, K.C.B., V.C., for the distinguished skill and ability with which he conducted the Expeditions of 1884 and 1885 in the Eastern Soudan, which resulted in the repeated defeat of the Arab forces under Osman Digna;

"3. That the Thanks of this House be given to Admiral Lord John Hay, K.C.B.; to Lieutenant-General Sir Frederick Charles Arthur Stephenson, K.C.B.; and to Vice-Admiral Sir William Nathan Wrighte Hewett, K.C.B., K.C.S.I., V.C., for the support and assistance they afforded to the forces employed in the operations in the Soudan; and to the Officers and Warrant Officers of the Navy, Army, and Royal Marines, including Her Majesty's Indian Forces, European and Native, for the energy and gallantry with which they executed the services in the Soudan Campaigns of 1884 and 1885, which they were called upon to perform;

"4. That the Thanks of this House be given to the Officers, Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, and Men of the Forces of New South Wales for the gallantry and zeal with which they co-operated in the Eastern Soudan with Her Majesty's British and Indian Forces employed there; and also to the Canadian boatmen and their officers for the valuable assistance rendered by them to the Expedition;

"5. That this House doth acknowledge and highly approve the gallantry, discipline, and good conduct displayed by the Petty Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, and Men of the Navy, Army, and Royal Marines, and of the New South Wales Contingent, and of Her Majesty's Indian Forces, European and Native, and by the Canadian boatmen; and this House doth also acknowledge the cordial good feeling which animated the United Force;

"6. That this House doth acknowledge and highly approve the zeal and gallantry with which the troops of His Highness the Khedive have co-operated in the Soudan with Her Majesty's Forces there employed;

"7. That this House doth acknowledge with admiration the distinguished valour, devotion, and conduct of—

Major-General Charles George Gordon, C.B.,
Major-General William Earle, C.B., C.S.I.,
Major-General Sir Herbert Stewart, K.C.B.,

and of those other Officers and Men who have perished during the campaign in the Soudan in the service of their Country; and feels deep sympathy with their relatives and friends:"—(*The Marquess of Salisbury.*)

The Duke of CAMBRIDGE: My Lords, I wish to say a few words with regard to this Resolution which the noble Marquess has so ably brought before us, and which has been so fitly and efficiently seconded by my noble Friend (Lord Carrington) on this side of the House. I venture, from a military standpoint, entirely to agree with the views which have been expressed by the Prime Minister. I consider that the troops of every arm, and under all the circumstances in which they were placed, performed their duty in a manner as creditably, if not even more so, as any of Her Majesty's troops have ever done. Their duties were of a most peculiar kind, as the noble Marquess has pointed out. The hardships — I may say the dangers—which were endured by these troops, without actual fighting—a great proportion of the men not having come into action—were faced in a manner deserving the greatest praise. Courage in the presence of danger is, I hope, one of the incidents of the English character; but to encounter hardships without danger, or apparently without it, is even more trying, as to discipline and many other matters, than when there is actual danger to be faced. The movement of a body of troops up the Nile, to a distance of 1,400 miles from its base, was one of the most singular operations ever performed, because the soldiers had to undertake almost naval duties. They were more engaged in boats than on shore, and they had to do that duty with a rapidity and a regularity on the part of every detachment without which the whole operation might have been brought to a stand. As I said before, the operation was most peculiar, and one even of extreme danger. The rapids are most difficult to contend with, and if it had not been for a great amount of courage and confidence many more boats than was the case would have been destroyed and men drowned. But, as it was, the loss of life amounted almost to nothing. I believe only one officer and 10 men were drowned in this operation, in which a large body of troops with camels and horses were engaged. Then, again, the defence of Khartoum and the advance across the Desert were most remarkable. In a country without water and without food, the troops who took part in that advance suffered much less than might have been expected. That arose not alone from the courage of the men and the care of the officers, but from the manner in which the whole of the operations had been planned and arranged by the General in command and those of his Staff. My Lords, Lord Wolseley had the most serious difficulties to contend with; but he performed his duty in a way highly to his credit, as we all expected would be the case; and I know no man feels more strongly than he how ably he was seconded by Sir Redvers Buller, the Chief of the Staff, and other gallant officers. With regard to the operations on the Red Sea at Suakin also, we were in considerable danger. The fanaticism of the Arabs, which the noble Marquess has most justly described, was such that death to them was welcome. They rushed on death; they scoffed danger in the view of future happiness, and the result was that it was impossible to deal with them according to the ordinary circumstances of war. The troops had to prepare themselves so as to be able to take part in arduous and peculiar operations—difficult in themselves and most trying to those engaged in them, the country being covered with brushwood, through which the men could hardly see beyond two or three yards. Their success, however, on every occasion was complete; and I venture to think with the noble Marquess that, as far as the soldiers are concerned, nothing but praise can be awarded to them, and also to those who had the honour of leading them. There are one or two circumstances of a special nature to which I wish to refer—one in particular is to the share taken in the Campaign by the Colonies and India. I believe this to be the first occasion on which a Colonial Force was actually brought to act with Her Majesty's troops out of its own sphere. Whether we look to the Canadian boatmen, to the Kroomen, who came from distant parts of Africa, to the Native troops, who came from India, or to the Australian Contingent, who were very fine men, and were only grieved that they could not perform more arduous duties, we must feel proud that they were brought into line to act in conjunction with Her Majesty's troops. It has been a pleasure to the Army which I represent to see the Colonists in such a position. It would have been the greatest pleasure to us if we in this country could have welcomed our comrades of the Colonies, and I trust that they have only taken the first step towards vigorous co-operation with the Mother Country should the necessity for it again arise. With regard to the Navy, I can only say that though the ships had little to do, we had a very considerable Naval Contingent with most excellent officers up the Nile. Lord Charles Beresford and others, who had the honour and many of the duties connected with the navigation of the boats up that river, did their work on every occasion most creditably, and in a manner most acceptable to their gallant friends of the Army, who always rejoiced to see their comrades of the Navy side by side with them. I quite agree with the noble Marquess that the losses we have sustained, though not so great as might have been feared, are quite great enough and deeply to be deplored, especially the loss of those distinguished men whose names the noble Marquess has mentioned. In General Gordon we have lost one of the finest officers and noblest men ever born into the world. Gallant in himself, religious to a high degree, and singularly conscientious in the performance of duty, he was, no doubt, a great leader of men, particularly of men of the Eastern nations, whose qualities he appreciated and with whom he had so much to do. Then, in General Sir Herbert Stewart we have lost a most efficient officer. He fell in the performance of a duty which, no doubt, would have been perfectly successful under him, as it was under those who succeeded him; and I will go further, and say that, should any emergency have arisen in the future, I have no doubt General Stewart would have been brought to the front and led troops, and perhaps armies, in which event he would probably have succeeded in any duty that might have been imposed upon him if his life had been prolonged. As regards General Earle, no finer or more gallant soldier ever existed. He was beloved by all, highly respected by all who knew him, and, as a soldier should, he died a soldier's death. There are many others whose names might be mentioned. But I will simply refer to that of Colonel Stewart. He went out originally with General Gordon, and shared with him all the dangers, all the difficulties, and all the anxieties of that prolonged stay at Khartoum of which we have all read. He was sent by General Gordon to try to communicate with Lord Wolseley, and in that endeavour, as your Lordships know, he lost his life. Although he could not be named in the Vote of Thanks, I think it right to take this opportunity of bringing his name specially forward. I am not aware that there is anything else that I need touch upon at this time. But I feel gratified that the opportunity should have been offered to your Lordships of passing this Vote of Thanks, and for this reason—that I know well that the officers and men of the Army highly and naturally appreciate the good opinion of their countrymen. The mode in which that opinion is most particularly acceptable to them is the expression, not only of Her Majesty's approbation, but the approbation of both Houses of Parliament on such occasions as these. My Lords, I have nothing more to add than to say that I cordially support the Vote of Thanks.

The said Resolutions severally *agreed to, nemine dissentiente.*

Ordered, That the Lord Chancellor do communicate the said Resolutions to General Lord Wolseley, Admiral Lord John Hay, the Viceroy and Governor-General of India, and the Secretary of State for the Colonies, respectively, and that they be requested by the Lord Chancellor to communicate the same to the several Officers referred to therein.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY—CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMISSION.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

THE FIRST LORD OF THE TREASURY (The Earl of IDDESLEIGH): My Lords, before your Lordships adjourn, I wish to refer to a matter about which there may be some mistake. There appears in the newspapers this morning a short correspondence between Mr. Broadhurst and myself with regard to a suggestion made by me that he should serve on the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the Depression of Trade. From Mr. Broadhurst's answer, it would appear that he considers that I had delayed the consideration of the question of labour representation until everything else had been settled. That, however, is not the case, and, in order that there may be no mistake in the matter, I wish to state that as soon as the communications with Mr. Shaw Lefevre and other Members of the late Government were concluded, I, for the first time, sent out a letter inviting other Gentlemen to join the Commission; and in the number that were asked were two

Representatives from the working men. One was Mr. Birtwhistle, who represents the Lancashire weavers, who accepted; and the other was Mr. Burnett, Secretary of the Amalgamated Engineers, who declined. I did not take any further steps for some time, because I was anxious to see what Representatives I could get from the Party opposite; and until I had done that I did not like to make any other proposals. I mentioned, from the first, that I had invited two Representatives of the working men to take part in the Commission; and, therefore, I am not liable to the charge which Mr. Broadhurst makes in his letter.

House adjourned during pleasure, at 2.45 P.M.

House resumed at 7 P.M.

The Lord Kintore—Chosen Speaker in the absence of the Lord Chancellor and the Lords Commissioners.

The following Bills were returned from the *Commons* with Amendments, and with Reasons for disagreeing to some of the Amendments made by their Lordships:—Housing of the Working Classes (England) Bill; Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill; and Poor Law Unions' Officers (Ireland) Bill.

On the Motion of The Lord Harris, the said Amendments and Reasons *ordered* to be *printed*, and to be considered *To-morrow*.

House adjourned at Seven o'clock, till To-morrow, Two o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

Wednesday, 12*th August*, 1885.

The House met at Three of the clock.

MINUTES.] — Public Bills — *Committee — Report*— Educational Endowments (Ireland) [176].

Considered as amended— Third Reading—Housing of the Working Classes (England) [248], and *passed*.

Withdrawn — Police Enfranchisement Extension * [219]; Moveable Dwellings * [239].

QUESTIONS.

VALUATION (METROPOLIS) ACT, 1869—APPEALS AGAINST ASSESSMENTS.

Mr. TOMLINSON asked the President of the Local Government Board, Whether his attention has been called to the large number of appeals against the recent assessments under "The Valuation (Metropolis) Act, 1869;" whether they have been caused principally by the fact that the gross value has been frequently fixed above the amount of the rent paid or the estimated letting value; whether it is the fact that the Assessment Committee have frequently given so short notice to ratepayers who have given notice of appeal from assessments of the time for hearing appeals as to make it impossible for them to attend; whether the Local Government Board have under consideration any measure for providing a scheme of valuation applicable to the whole Kingdom; and, whether, in this event, they will, prior to introducing such a measure, consider the defects in the scheme of "The Valuation (Metropolis) Act, 1869?"

The PRESIDENT (Mr. A. J. Balfour), in reply, said, that the Local Government Board had no information with regard to the matter referred to in the Question of the hon. Member, neither was there any Bill providing a scheme with regard to it under the consideration of the Government.

Mr. TOMLINSON: Will the right hon. Gentleman, in the next Parliament, have any objection to lay on the Table a Return of the number of appeals?

The PRESIDENT: Perhaps my hon. Friend will ask me that Question in the next Parliament.

Mr. TOMLINSON: I beg to give Notice that I will ask the Question.

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)—DISORDERLY HOUSES—CASE OF MRS. JEFFRIES.

Mr. CALLAN, who had a Notice on the Paper for Returns of Reports by Mr. Batchelor, of the Solicitors' Department of the Treasury, and by Inspector Minahan, relative to the case of Mrs. Jeffries—asked the hon. Member for Preston, Whether he would be kind enough to withdraw his Notice of opposition; and, further, whether he had put down that Notice in the interests of the late Home Secretary or in the interests of Mrs. Jeffries?

Mr. TOMLINSON said, he considered the Reports were confidential, and he declined to withdraw his opposition.

POST OFFICE (IRELAND)—THE NEW POST OFFICE AT MULLINGAR.

Mr. T. D. SULLIVAN asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether the Irish Board of Works will cause proper drainage accommodation to be provided for the new Post Office at Mullingar?

The SECRETARY to the TREASURY (Sir Henry Holland) (who replied) said, he had no reason to suppose that the Board of Works had overlooked the matter alluded to; but a copy of the Question would be sent to them with an inquiry.

LAW AND POLICE (IRELAND)—THE RIOT IN COUNTY MONAGHAN.

Mr. HEALY asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it was while on leave of absence that Dr. Hall, medical officer, led the armed Orange attack on the Catholics in county Monaghan?

The CHIEF SECRETARY (Sir William Hart Dyke), in reply, said, that as the matter was still *sub judice* he preferred not to answer the Question.

THE MAGISTRACY (IRELAND)—MR. HANS WHITE, J.P.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR asked the Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Whether it is a fact that Mr. Hans White, J.P. of the Queen's County, recently ordered the police to watch the cattle of a widow named Bannon, with a view to summoning her if any of them were caught straying on the public road; whether subsequently, on the woman's being summoned before himself, he fined her 1*s.* 1*d.*, and ordered her to pay costs to the amount of 7*s.* 6*d.*, including the car hire for the police on the watching journey; whether such costs could be lawfully demanded; and, whether the Government will direct the police to abstain from demanding such costs, if illegal?

The CHIEF SECRETARY for IRELAND (Sir William Hart Dyke) asked that the Question should be put down for Friday, as he had not had time to obtain the required information.

Mr. ARTHUR O'CONNOR said, he would not trouble the right hon. Gentleman by repeating the Question if he would undertake to look into the matter, and see that justice was done.

The CHIEF SECRETARY said, he would communicate with the hon. Member.

REGISTRATION OF VOTERS (IRELAND) ACT—ADDITIONAL REVISING BARRISTERS.

Mr. HEALY asked Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, If he can now give the names of the Assistant Revising Barristers, and state to what counties they will be appointed?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes): I was under the impression that the names of these gentlemen would be published to-day in *The Dublin Gazette.* I have inquired by telegram, but have not yet received an answer. I myself am not acquainted with the names; but if I receive the information in the course of the Sitting I shall communicate with the hon. and learned Member.

MOTION.

EGYPT—SOUDAN EXPEDITION—VOTE OF THANKS TO HER MAJESTY'S MILITARY AND NAVAL FORCES.

RESOLUTION.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, in rising to propose the Vote of Thanks to the Forces engaged in the Soudan Expeditions, said: Mr. Speaker—Sir, I have the honour to move the series of Resolutions which I have placed on the Paper, proposing that the thanks of this House be given to Her Majesty's Forces by sea and land, in return for their gallantry and conduct in the late Campaigns in the Soudan. Sir, I hope, and I think, it will not be felt that the period of the Session at which these Resolutions are moved in any way detracts from their character or from their value. It seems to me a not unfitting close to the work of a Session and of a Parliament that we should endeavour to express our gratitude to those who have worked and fought so well for their country in those distant climes, and our sympathies and our admiration for those who have lost their lives in those services. Sir, I trust that these Resolutions may meet, not merely with the cordial, but with the unanimous, assent of the House of Commons. It seems to me that, if we owe it to Her Majesty's Forces to pass them, we owe it even more to ourselves not to mar the gracefulness of our action by allowing Party differences on political subjects to intrude in a Vote which is of quite a different character. Sir, we have carefully excluded from the terms of these Resolutions anything that can raise a discussion as to the policy which dictated these Expeditions to the Soudan, or as to any political subject connected with them; and nothing, I trust, in the remarks which I am about to address to the House will in any way depart from that example. It seems to me that all we have to consider on this occasion is the conduct and the gallantry of Her Majesty's Forces in doing their duty to their country, and our own duty in expressing our appreciation of the services they have rendered. Now, Sir, I am afraid that it will not be possible for me, in the outline which I shall venture to sketch of the operations which have been undertaken and carried through, to give either a sufficient history of the facts, or anything like a due acknowledgment of the merits of individuals. The facts have spoken, and will long speak, for themselves; and with regard to the merits of individuals, we have felt it so impossible to name even a fractional part of those who ought to be named in a Resolution of this kind, and so invidious to select, that we have purposely confined ourselves to those who have occupied the highest positions only in the work that has been done. Sir, I would also ask the House, if I do not particularize the services that have been rendered by the different branches of Her Majesty's Forces, to attribute it to its true cause—namely, that the Navy, the Army, the Marines, and all the branches of the Forces engaged performed those duties with so much harmony and unity that I think they ought to be considered and spoken of together. The two Expeditions, to Suakin in February, 1884, and to Khartoum in the autumn of last year, had this in common—that both of them aimed at the relief of a beleaguered garrison, and neither of them succeeded in its object. But in neither case can it be said for a moment that the Expedition to Suakin in 1884 or the Expedition to Khartoum last autumn failed through any want of skill or ability on the part of the Generals commanding, or of courage and discipline on the part of our soldiers. Generals and soldiers alike faced and conquered all the difficulties, and all the enemies that were opposed to them; but there was one enemy with which they could not deal, and that, Sir, was Time. Time alone was the reason why each of those Expeditions failed to accomplish its object. Yet, Sir, I do not think, as I have said, that anyone will say that either of these Expeditions was a failure. Take the story, in the first place, of the first Expedition to Suakin. The orders for the Expedition to Suakin in 1884 were received by General Stephenson on the 12th of February. By the 28th of February a force of 4,500 men had actually disembarked at Trinkitat; the battle of El Teb was fought, and Tokar, the object of the Expedition, was reached on the 1st of March. Three days later the force returned, bringing back about 700 of the survivors of the garrison and inhabitants of Tokar. The battle of Tamai was fought on the 13th of March, and the Expedition was concluded on the 28th. The military result of that Expedition was that the power of Osman Digna was effectually crippled for a time by the two severe blows struck at him by the Expedition; and to do more than this was not in the power of the General or the gallant force entrusted with the Expedition. Take, again, the second Suakin Expedition. On the 8th of February last it was decided to open up the Suakin-Berber route, and to make a railway to Berber. On the 13th of March a force of nearly 11,000 officers and men were assembled at Suakin, and during the following month the important positions of Tamai, Handoub, and Otuo were successfully occupied. The railway was laid and finished for a considerable portion of the distance from Suakin to which the advance of our Forces reached. By the time the Force was withdrawn it is not too much to say that the power of Osman

Digna had been absolutely crushed, and a position obtained from which there was every prospect of securing the goodwill and confidence of some of the most important Arab tribes had it been desired to pursue the undertaking. All this was not obtained without arduous efforts, and the calling forth of the best qualities of our officers and men, who, in the Eastern Soudan, as in the Desert march to Khartoum, met and conquered the fanatical bravery of a vigilant and indefatigable foe simply by their superior discipline and cool resourceful courage. But they had to contend in both cases with enemies worse than any foe with whom they fought in actual combat—with constant exposure and monotonous toil, with long and fatiguing marches under a burning sun, and, especially at Suakin, with a most trying—I might say a most deadly—climate. All these evils they surmounted with a patient endurance and uncomplaining heroism, which have been, perhaps, the finest characteristics of British soldiers whenever and wherever they have been tried. I will venture to say that among all the proud records of the British Army none will be found in which these qualities have been more completely displayed than in the operations round Suakin and Tamai. Let me turn for a few moments to the Nile Expedition. I do not think that our pride in that glorious march—that fighting march—to Metammeh and back over the Nile Desert, or in those stirring records of the voyage to Khartoum and back—which include deeds worthy of the heroic age—ought to dim our recollection or prevent our acknowledgment of the exceptional difficulties of organization and transport which had to be encountered in the Nile Expedition, or the way in which those difficulties were overcome. For more than 500 miles of river, cataract, and desert, the whole system of transport for men, material, supplies, and stores, including medical stores, which were never better supplied in any Expedition which has left this country—had to be organized. Whaleboats had to be forced up 190 miles of most turbulent and dangerous water; camels had to be taken across long stretches of waterless desert by soldiers who knew nothing of the management of boats or of the camels which they had to ride. Yet all this was successfully done with hardly any loss of life, and with a willing cheeriness which insured the success of those most difficult operations. I do not believe that in any Expedition which ever left this country was everything that tends to the efficiency and health of the troops more completely cared for than it was in this Nile Expedition. When the Force was directed to withdraw down the Nile the withdrawal was effected at the hottest period of the year, when the river was lowest and in the most difficult condition to navigate, with the loss of only a single life. Not only that, but 14,000 refugees from Dongola were sent down in safety and in comfort; and I do not think that stronger testimony could be given than the recital of these facts to the remarkable ability with which the operations were planned, and the skill with which they were carried out. I should like, however, for a few minutes, to advert to a distinguishing feature of these Campaigns, which has proved—first to ourselves, and then to the whole world—what the real resources of the British Empire are. There never was a Force of the size of those engaged in these Expeditions composed of men from more different latitudes—British, Indian, Egyptian, Soudanese, Kroomen; and last, but by no means least, it will always be remembered there were Canadians and Australians. No doubt these latter were few in number; but it is not their number, but the fact of their presence there, which has made this Expedition memorable; for they have shown—conclusively shown—to the world that strong and deep loyalty which is the real bond of union between this country and her Colonies, and that, at the faintest idea of danger, our Colonists will rally around the Mother Country, and fight with her soldiers and sailors wherever they may be required. Nothing can be stronger than the testimony borne by General Graham to the spirit of good-fellowship, as he described it, existing between the Australian and the Canadian and the British troops, and to the strong determination which animated them all to preserve untarnished the ancient reputation of the British Army. Sir, so long as these feelings exist and increase—as I believe they will increase—I am sure that in no emergency in which this country may find itself need there be any fear of the result. I am convinced that if we only treat our Colonies rightly, we have in them a fund of strength which would enable us at any great crisis to face even the nations of the world. One word in conclusion as to the last paragraph of this Resolution. We ask the House in that paragraph to record their admiration of the distinguished valour, devotion, and conduct of General Gordon, General Stewart, General Earle, and all those other officers and men who have perished during the Campaign in the Soudan in the service of their country, and their deep sympathy with their relatives and friends. I can attempt to add nothing to the eloquent tribute which, only a few days ago, my right hon. and learned Friend the First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) rendered to the memory of General Gordon. This only I will say—that I think the character, life, and deeds of General Gordon will ever be remembered in this country. But it was a strange and a sad coincidence that the Commanders both of the Nile and the Desert Columns of the Nile Expedition should have fallen at the head of their troops. Each was a Commander such as the country cannot afford to lose. The rapidity of General Stewart's rise in his Profession gave promise of the highest distinction had he been spared to us; and the singular charm of his character was such as not only to drive away the shafts of envy, but to endear him to all his comrades. General Earle was not less successful in gaining, not only the thorough confidence, but the personal liking, of the soldiers under his command. I venture to say that no two men were ever more really and truly sorrowed for by the troops they left behind; and I know nothing which has a stronger title than this on the part of the soldier to our admiration and regret. I will not detain the House longer. If these Nile Expeditions did not rescue General Gordon or relieve Khartoum, I think they at least succeeded in one way. They showed the world that we could send from this country an Expedition of considerable importance, under very great difficulties, completely furnished in all respects, to the most distant regions, led by able and successful Generals, backed by officers of singular ability, and composed of men of whom I will only say that I believe "they could go anywhere and do anything." They have done their work for the time; and they have shown themselves capable of doing similar work—perhaps at a more crucial moment—so as to win credit for themselves and safety for their country. It is for us now to acknowledge what they have done, and to do our duty—I will not say to them, but to ourselves—by according to them, I hope without a dissentient voice, that which every soldier and sailor looks upon as his best and highest reward—the thanks and approbation of his country, voted by the people's Representatives in Parliament.

THE MARQUESS OF HARTINGTON: Mr. Speaker, it is a great satisfaction to me to be permitted by the courtesy of the House, as I trust I may be, to associate myself and my Colleagues in the late Government in the proceedings in which the House is now engaged; and, Sir, the able, eloquent, and lucid statement which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has made in moving these Resolutions has rendered my task an extremely easy one. The Chancellor of the Exchequer, following the laudable precedent of past times, has carefully abstained from entering into any discussion of the political considerations connected with these Expeditions. I think that precedent is a laudable one; because it appears to me that it is extremely desirable, in addition to those honours and rewards which it is in the power of Her Majesty, on the advice of her responsible Ministers, to bestow upon our gallant soldiers and sailors for deeds of this character, that the appreciation of their countrymen should be conveyed to them through the method of a Vote of Thanks of both Houses of Parliament. It is extremely desirable that such thanks should be voted to them totally irrespective of any opinion which the House may form, or any Party in the House may form, of the policy which actuated the operations, and altogether irrespective of any results that may have been achieved. We cannot expect our soldiers and sailors to be more indifferent than anyone among us can be to the success or failure of the operations in which they are engaged. But, Sir, whether successful or not, it is due on our part to them to recognize the spirit and the qualities displayed by them utterly irrespective of what the results accomplished may be. It is, above all, our duty on the present occasion, when there is some sense of failure and some sense of inadequate results for the sacrifices made, that we should do what lies in our power to mitigate that sense of disappointment, and to bring forward clearly and strongly to those engaged in our Service that we, one and all, recognize that, if failure there has been, that failure has not been due to any shortcomings on the part of the officers who designed those operations, or on the part of the men who carried them out to their end. Well, Sir, it is, I think, a satisfactory circumstance that almost one of the very last acts in which Parliament is to be engaged during the present Session will be one in which we shall, I hope, be able to be practically unanimous. The present Session and the present Parliament have not been wanting in subjects on which there has been sharp debate among us, nor has there been wanting energy in the way in which our controversies have been conducted; but it is a satisfactory consideration that almost the very last proceeding in which we shall be engaged is one in which Party differences will disappear, and in which we shall be unanimously engaged in rendering a necessary and just tribute to the services of our gallant soldiers and sailors. The only regret I experience is that the proceedings in which we are now engaged take place at so late a period of the Session as to render it impossible for a larger number of Members on both sides of the House to be associated with us in this act. Sir, I am glad it has been possible for the Government to include in the Vote of Thanks which we are now considering the operations which were conducted at Suakin in the spring of last year. The House may remember that on several occasions I was asked—the late Government were asked—whether it was their intention last year to propose a Vote of Thanks to those soldiers and sailors who had been engaged in those operations. I can assure the House it was from no spirit of disparagement to the services either of the troops or of their Commanders in that Campaign that the Government, after much consideration, came to the conclusion that it was not in accordance with the usual precedents to move a Vote of Thanks on that occasion. We carefully examined the precedents that appeared to bear upon the subject; and although the question was not by any means free from doubt, we came reluctantly to the conclusion that to ask Parliament to agree to a Vote of Thanks on that occasion would be to give some extension to the practice which had up to that time prevailed, and might possibly tend to diminish in some degree the just value attached to the recognition of the deeds of our soldiers and sailors by both Houses of Parliament. It is certainly most appropriate on this occasion, on a Vote mainly relating to larger and more extended operations which have since been carried on, to place the question of our appreciation of their services beyond all doubt, and to do what is in our power to repair the omission, if omission there be, by expressing our appreciation of the services of the troops engaged in Suakin last year as fully as of those engaged in the present year both there and on the Nile. After the full and clear expressions of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, it is quite unnecessary for me to enter in detail into the operations of the Campaigns or of the gallant deeds performed. I would only advert to one or two principal features incident to those Campaigns. As to the Suakin Campaign, it has been marked, as far as I am aware, by incidents which have been more or less common to many Campaigns which have been undertaken by our troops in various parts of the world, and especially in India and Africa. The troops engaged in the neighbourhood of Suakin have been exposed, as stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, to great toil and to great hardship under a climate which is especially trying to inhabitants of Northern regions. They have had to work hard and to fight hard under a burning sun, and frequently with an insufficient supply of that greatest necessary of life—water. These are incidents which have been common, as I have said, to many Campaigns in which our troops have been engaged; but the Suakin Campaign has, in my opinion, been marked in a very high degree by those incidents. They have also had, under these trying circumstances, to fight an enemy superior—greatly superior—in numbers; and if inferior in discipline and organization, or in knowledge of the arts of war, that inferiority has been amply compensated by the determined and fanatical bravery which animated them. The Nile Expedition has been marked by incidents which, so far as I am aware, have not had any complete precedent on any former occasion. The ascent of the Nile for a distance of 1,500 miles from what was practically the base of the Expedition at Alexandria, by means which had to be improvised for the occasion, and means which depended altogether on the troops themselves for their efficiency, is, in my belief, a precedent altogether new in our military annals. The conception and execution of that operation will form a new chapter in our military history. In my opinion, great credit is due to Lord Wolseley for the courage and self-reliance with which he formed the plan of that operation, and for the manner in which he staked his great military reputation on the success of measures which were hitherto untried, and of which we had no knowledge. And not less credit is due to the soldiers and sailors who were engaged in that Expedition for the manner in which they undertook new and untried duties, and for the perseverance and resolution with which they grappled with and encountered all the difficulties and hardships which were entailed upon them. It is said—and I do not know whether upon absolutely good authority, but I believe on sufficient authority—that the conduct of our troops in the Nile Expedition has excited the enthusiastic approval of a great military authority—no less than that of Count Moltke, of the German Army. It is said that Count Moltke, in speaking on the subject to a distinguished Englishman, made use of expressions to this effect. He is reported to have said that our troops on the Nile were heroes, not soldiers; that our British Cavalry had become Infantry; our Infantry had turned into sailors, and our sailors into Mounted Infantry. In short, the handiness of the troops and their powers of endurance have excited the admiration of one who is justly considered to be the leading military authority in Europe. Not less remarkable an incident of the Nile Expedition was the march, to which the right hon. Gentleman has referred, of the Column across the Bayuda Desert. That Column—cut off from its base, dependent upon itself and on its slender means of transport for every necessary of life, including, to a great extent, the greatest necessary of life to all—namely, water—committed itself to the passage of a Desert which was almost unexplored. Little was known of the difficulties which would have to be encountered, except that the Column would be met undoubtedly by an enemy, the numbers of whom it was difficult to estimate, and of whom nothing could be accurately foretold, except that it would probably fight with the same determined courage as had been previously evinced by the tribes of the Eastern Soudan. That movement has been criticized for its rashness; but success in war is not to be accomplished solely by the exercise of prudence or judgment. There are occasions on which it is necessary for the most prudent and most skilful General to run risks and dangers, and trust something to the valour, determination, and endurance of his troops. In my opinion, the wisdom of this movement has been amply proved, not only by the success with which it was accomplished, but also by the proof, which was almost immediately afterwards afforded, of the urgent necessity for a movement of this kind. I cannot upon this occasion, and I think the House cannot, withhold its sympathy and admiration of the small body of men who, under the leadership of Sir Charles Wilson, supplemented that march across the Desert by the perilous and romantic Expedition up the river to Khartoum. This would not be the occasion upon which it would be fitting that I should enter upon any matter of controversy whatever. I am aware that criticism has been levelled at what was alleged to have been a slight delay on the part of Sir Charles Wilson in embarking on that Expedition. I think it is only due to that gallant officer—and I can express my own opinion without committing any other Member of the House—to say that in the Paper which has been laid before Parliament Sir Charles Wilson has justified himself from any imputation of that kind. Whatever opinions there may be in the minds of some hon. Members on that point, there are none, I believe, who will withhold a tribute of admiration to the coolness and courage with which that Expedition, when it did set out, was undertaken. There are none who will withhold their sympathy from Sir Charles Wilson and his gallant companions in the bitter disappointment which they must have experienced on their arrival before Khartoum only to find that it was in the hands of the enemy; there are none who will withhold their admiration of the manner in which the extraordinary perils of the return of that Expedition were encountered; and I am sure there are none who will withhold their admiration from that most gallant feat of arms performed by Lord Charles Beresford, and by the soldiers and sailors under his command, in rescuing Sir Charles Wilson and his companions from a position of almost unparalleled and unexampled danger. I have no doubt that in the selection of the names of officers who have been specially mentioned in the Resolution before the House the precedents of former occasions have been strictly adhered to. There are many who, like the Chancellor of the Exchequer, will regret the omissions in the list of names which the adherence to precedent has entailed. As to the names which are mentioned, I will only detain the House with a very few observations. Of Lord Wolseley I have already spoken. I believe that this is the first Expedition with which that gallant officer has been associated which has not ended in the most complete success, and in which the results aimed at have not been fully achieved; but I believe that the reputation of Lord Wolseley will not have suffered in any degree from his association with this enterprize; and that the confidence that he has hitherto so justly inspired in those who have had the honour and privilege of serving under and with him has not, in the slightest degree, been diminished by the part which he has taken in this Expedition. It is extremely gratifying to me to have this opportunity of expressing, on my own behalf, and on behalf of the late Government, our sense of the obligations under which we stand with regard to General Sir Frederick Stephenson. The manner in which that gallant officer accepted the position confided to him, and the untiring manner in which he worked to secure the success of the Expedition, which naturally it would have been his greatest desire personally to have commanded, is worthy, in my opinion, of the highest commendation of this House. In the conduct which Sir Frederick Stephenson has pursued, it appears to me that he has set an example of duty and of uncomplaining discipline which are worthy of the highest admiration. I will not attempt, by repetition, to weaken the effect of those numerous and eloquent tributes which have been paid to the memory of General Gordon. This is not the occasion upon which it would be fitting for me to speak of the great moral qualities of that hero. It is enough for me to say upon this occasion that the records—unfortunately imperfect records—of the siege and defence of Khartoum by General Gordon and his devoted band of followers will for ever secure for it a most prominent place in the history of those heroic actions which have so frequently been performed by individual Englishmen. The right hon. Gentleman has spoken of General Earle and of Sir Herbert Stewart. I have already had an opportunity—and I will only repeat what I said then—of expressing my deep sense of the loss which Her Majesty's Service has sustained by the death of those gallant officers. They were officers who were conspicuous not only by the possession of great military qualities, but also in the most pre-eminent degree by the manner in which they had succeeded in securing the confidence, and not only the confidence, but the affection of all those who had the honour and privilege of serving under them; and I believe there are no two officers of the British Army who ever met with a more glorious death, or who in that glorious death were more sincerely mourned by their country and their comrades. I should like on this occasion to add an expression of my deep regret at the singularly unfortunate fate of another officer not mentioned in the Vote—that of Colonel Stewart, the companion of General Gordon. It was not his fate to die at the head of victorious troops. His rather was the sad fate of falling a victim to the treacherous assassin; but not less so has he fallen doing his duty to his Sovereign and his country, as those officers have done whose happier fate enabled them to perish in the hour of victory and in the midst of their admiring countrymen. There are others whose names I am sure the Chancellor of the Exchequer would have been glad to have been able to include in this expression of Vote of Thanks. There was Sir Redvers Buller, Chief of the Staff of Lord Wolseley.

The merits of Sir Redvers Buller have been amply and fully and generously acknowledged by his Chief. The services which he rendered in the conduct of the retreat from Gubat across the Bayuda Desert were, in my opinion, not less conspicuous, not less worthy of record and of the best thanks of this House, than those which were performed by his illustrious comrade and friend Sir Herbert Stewart in his advance across that Desert. Nor would the House, I am sure, but for precedent, withhold its thanks from General Brackenbury, who succeeded General Earle, on whom it devolved to conduct the scarcely less difficult and arduous retirement down the rapids of the Nile from the advanced post which that force had occupied. Sir, there are other officers whom I regret that a strict adherence to precedent makes it impossible to include in this expression of our thanks. The services of the Indian, the Australian, and the Canadian Contingents have, I am glad to see, been recognized in the Resolution now before us; but it would have been satisfactory to all of us, I am sure, if it had been in accordance with established precedent, that the names of General Hudson, who commanded the Indian Contingent; of Colonel Denison, who commanded the Canadian Voyageurs; and of Colonel Richardson, who commanded the New South Wales Contingent, could also have been included in this Resolution. In my opinion, it is impossible to overestimate the good conduct of all these Contingents. A portion of the Indian Contingent especially has had the opportunity of rendering, in company with British troops, most gallant and most conspicuous services; and I have been informed by officers who were present on the occasion that nothing could exceed, not only the courage, but also the steadiness, the firmness, and the soldier-like qualities which were displayed by the Sikh regiments on the occasion of the attack on M'Neill's zereba—a coolness, steadiness, and courage which did much to avert the great and imminent danger which at one time threatened the whole of that force. Sir, I think that we ought not to omit on this occasion, without entering into any details, to notice the credit that is due to those officers connected with the Departments at home, to whose exertions so much of the credit of the admirable preparations which have been referred to by the Chancellor of the Exchequer was due. It is admitted, I believe, on all hands, that the commissariat, the transport, and the medical arrangements were made with a completeness and a perfection which have certainly never been surpassed, and which, I believe, have never, on any previous occasion, been equalled. To the officers of the Departments at home, on whom the duty devolved of purchasing and sending out supplies, and to the officers of Departments in the field, on whom devolved the duty of distributing and making use of them for the benefit of the troops, in my opinion, the greatest possible credit is due. I believe that the perfection of the medical arrangements in this Campaign has been the cause of mitigating, to a great extent, the unavoidable sufferings which must be endured by our soldiers on all occasions of this kind, and that on no previous occasion has the devotion to duty which has been shown by the medical officers of every rank been exceeded. Well, Sir, I shall not detain the House longer. In conclusion, I will only say that these Campaigns, though they have failed to achieve that complete success, or to achieve those permanent and definite results which alone can fully compensate the country for the sacrifices which it has been called upon to make, and which alone can reconcile the country to the unavoidable horrors and miseries of war, have done credit to the Military and Naval Forces of the British Crown. They have proved that the ancient courage of our soldiers and sailors has in no degree deteriorated. These Campaigns have also proved that their intelligence, their resource, and the knowledge of their profession, possessed both by officers and men, have considerably increased. They have proved also how wide and varied are the military resources of the British Crown; and that for all the purposes of war, as well as for the purposes of peace, the British Empire is not only a name but a reality. Wide as are the responsibilities of an extended Empire, and the responsibilities which our extended interests impose upon us, these Campaigns have proved that we can count upon the willing and effective support of all the citizens of the British Empire, and all the subjects of the British Crown, in every quarter of the globe.

Resolved, Nemine Contradicente, That the Thanks of this House be given to General Lord Wolseley, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., for the distinguished skill and ability with which he planned and conducted the Expedition of 1884-5 by the Nile to the Soudan.

Resolved, Nemine Contradicente, That the Thanks of this House be given to Lieutenant General Sir Gerald Graham, K.C.B., V.C., for the distinguished skill and ability with which he conducted the Expeditions of 1884 and 1885 in the Eastern Soudan, which resulted in the repeated defeat of the Arab Forces under Osman Digna.

Resolved, Nemine Contradicente, That the Thanks of this House be given to Admiral Lord John Hay, K.C.B., to Lieutenant General Sir Frederick Charles Arthur Stephenson, K.C.B., and to Vice Admiral Sir William Nathan Wrighte Hewett, K.C.B., K.C.S.I., V.C., for the support and assistance they afforded to the Forces employed in the operations in the Soudan; and to the Officers and Warrant Officers of the Navy, Army, and Royal Marines, including Her Majesty's Indian Forces, European and Native, for the energy and gallantry with which they executed the services in the Soudan Campaigns of 1884 and 1885, which they were called upon to perform.

Resolved, Nemine Contradicente, That the Thanks of this House be given to the Officers, Warrant Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, and Men of the Forces of New South Wales for the gallantry and zeal with which they co-operated in the Eastern Soudan with Her Majesty's British and Indian Forces employed there; and also to the Canadian Boatmen and their Officers for the valuable assistance rendered by them to the Expedition.

Resolved, Nemine Contradicente, That this House doth acknowledge and highly approve the gallantry, discipline, and good conduct displayed by the Petty Officers, Non-Commissioned Officers, and Men of the Navy, Army, and Royal Marines, and of the New South Wales Contingent, and of Her Majesty's Indian Forces, European and Native, and by the Canadian Boatmen; and this House doth also acknowledge the cordial good feeling which animated the United Force.

Resolved, Nemine Contradicente, That this House doth acknowledge and highly approve the zeal and gallantry with which the Troops of His Highness the Khedive have co-operated in the Soudan with Her Majesty's Forces there employed.

Resolved, Nemine Contradicente, That this House doth acknowledge with admiration the distinguished valour, devotion, and conduct of—

Major General Charles George Gordon, C.B.,

Major General William Earle, C.B., C.S.I.,

Major General Sir Herbert Stewart, K.C.B.,

and of those other Officers and Men who have perished during the Campaign in the Soudan in the service of their Country, and feels deep sympathy with their relatives and friends.—(*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.*)

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

——o——

HOUSING OF THE WORKING CLASSES (ENGLAND) BILL [*Lords*].—[Bill 248.]

(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

CONSIDERATION.

Order for Consideration, as amended, read.

Bill, as amended, *considered.*

The SECRETARY of STATE for the HOME DEPARTMENT (Sir R. Assheton Cross) said, that, in fulfilment of a promise given last evening by his right hon. Friend (Sir Michael Hicks-Beach), he would, as an Amendment, move to omit the latter part of Clause 3, in order to insert the words "at a fair market price." The effect of the Amendment would be that the Local Authorities would have to pay for the land at its current value, the arbitrators having no power to take into consideration the purposes for which it was to be used.

Amendment proposed,

In page 4, line 37, after "works," leave out to end of amended Clause, and insert "at a fair market price."—(*Sir R. Assheton Cross.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, he thought the right hon. Gentleman opposite had very fairly met the objections of the minority on the subject.

Sir GEORGE CAMPBELL said, that, on the contrary, he was very sorry that the right hon. Gentleman should have surrendered in this matter to a minority, which, however well-meaning and respectable it might be — and it undoubtedly was both — was still an insignificant minority of the House. He was an admirer of the Bill, thinking it a very good one, and he was glad that it had been extended to Scotland. He had no wish in any way to obstruct it; but he must say he deeply regretted that more favour had not been shown to the poor of London, who were very inadequately provided for. By the operation of the Amendment these prison sites would not be devoted to the benefit of the poor of London, unless Local Authorities competed with the rich for the purchase of land. Had the Bill stood as originally introduced, it would have been an important step towards the "municipalization" of the land.

Question put, and *negatived.*

Question, "That those words be there inserted," put, and *agreed to.*

MR. PICTON said, he would suggest that a similar Amendment should be made in a later clause relating to Municipal Corporations, who, in justice to ratepayers, ought not to part with land at less than "a fair market price."

SIR CHARLES W. DILKE said, the power given in that case was only a permissive one, and Town Councils might be trusted to exercise their powers properly. The difference in the case of London was that it was the Treasury, and not a representative Body, that had to part with the land.

MR. BROADHURST moved, as an Amendment, to strike out the Proviso in Clause 14, to the effect that the annual value of gardens attached to "cottages" should not exceed £1.

Amendment proposed,

In page 9, line 14, by leaving out all the words from the word "acre" to the end of the Clause.—(*Mr. Broadhurst.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Bill."

THE SECRETARY OF STATE (Sir R. ASSHETON CROSS) said, he could not consent to the Amendment; but he would consent to the Proviso being amended by the substitution of £3 for £1.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *amended,* and *agreed to.*

Queen's *Consent* signified.

Bill read the third time, and *passed,* with the Amendments.

LABOURERS (IRELAND) (No. 2) BILL.

(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

[BILL 265.] CONSIDERATION OF LORDS' AMENDMENTS.

Order for Consideration of Lords' Amendments read.

Lords' Amendments *considered.*

Page 5, line 12, leave out ("twelve") and insert ("six"), the first Amendment, read a second time.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Colonel Nolan.*)

MR. SEXTON said, he would impress upon the House the necessity and importance of disagreeing with the Lords in their Amendment. In another Bill the number of signatures required was 20.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, that the number 12 was inserted in the Bill with the unanimous assent of the Commons; and if the objection was pressed they were not prepared to agree with the Lords in reducing the number to "six."

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Amendments, as far as page 6, line 38, read a second time.

Page 6, line 38, leave out ("more") and insert ("less.")

MR. SEXTON, in rising to move that the House do disagree with the Lords in this Amendment, giving the landlord more than one month, instead of one month, to petition against a scheme for the erection of cottages, said, it would enable a landlord to obstruct indefinitely any scheme. He would not press his objection, however, if the Government promised that they would get the Local Government Board to make a regulation against undue time being given to petition. It would remain entirely at their discretion, and he should be satisfied with an assurance that they would not permit any unreasonable delay, seeing that it was of the essence of the Bill that it should be promptly carried into effect.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE) said, he would promise that the Local Government Board would issue such regulations. The matter, as the hon. Gentleman had said, would be entirely under their control, and he did not think there was any intention that the time should be unduly extended.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Page 10, after the first ("cottage") insert ("which is in a bad state of repair"), and leave out ("or may purchase any existing cottage"), the next Amendment, read a second time.

MR. SEXTON, in rising to move that the House do disagree with the Lords in this Amendment in reference to the compulsory purchase of cottages in a good state of repair, said, the effect of the Amendment would be that while the Board of Guardians could purchase a house in a bad state of repair, and allot half an acre of land to it, they would have no power to do the same with respect to a cottage in a good state of repair. The result would be that the labourer in a bad cottage at the present moment would soon be better off than a labourer now occupying a good cottage.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, that the Government must support the Lords' Amendment in this case. They could not give the Sanitary Authority power to purchase compulsorily cottages in a good state of repair.

COLONEL NOLAN pressed upon the Government the necessity of disagreeing with the Lords' Amendment.

COLONEL COLTHURST supported the Motion of the hon. Member for Sligo (Mr. Sexton).

MR. VILLIERS STUART said, he also thought the Government should reject the Amendment made by the Lords.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, he thought the difficulty which presented itself to the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland, regarding houses in good repair, would be met by enabling the Guardians to purchase "by agreement" houses in a good state of repair.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE) said, that the Government would accept the proposal of the hon. and gallant Member for the County of Dublin (Colonel King-Harman) to add the words "by agreement" to the Amendment of the Lords.

MR. HEALY said, that would not meet the difficulty, as there was no power given under the Act to enable the Guardians to add the half-acre of land to a cottage in good repair purchased "by agreement."

MR. SEXTON said, they would accept the addition of the words "by agreement," if the Government would consent to add—

"And may purchase and allot to any occupant of any such existing cottage half an acre of land."

MR. TOTTENHAM said, there would be no objection to the proposal if the half-an-acre of land, as well as the cottage in good repair, were purchased by agreement.

MR. SEXTON said, they would accept that as the best they could get.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Lords' Amendment *amended,* by inserting in lieu of the words struck out by the Lords, the following words:—

("Or may purchase by agreement any existing cottage, or by agreement may purchase and allot to the occupant of such existing cottage half an acre of land.")

Page 8, line 22, after the word "acre," to insert—

"Provided also, That, except in the case of a tract of land in the neighbourhood of a town or village as aforesaid, a sanitary authority shall not let or permit to be held any land acquired by them under the said Act, as amended by this Act, to or by any person who is not also tenant to the sanitary authority of a dwelling-house,"

the next Amendment, being read a second time.

Amendment proposed to be made to the said Lords' Amendment, by leaving out the words "in the case of a tract of land in the neighbourhood of a town or village as aforesaid," and inserting the words "as hereinbefore provided,"—(*Mr. Sexton,*)—instead thereof.

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the said Amendment."

Amendment to the said Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Amendment *agreed to.*

Page 8, leave out lines 24 & 25, the next Amendment, *disagreed to.*

Page 9, line 36, after ("authority") insert ("subject to the approval of the Local Government Board"), the next Amendment, read a second time.

MR. SEXTON, in rising to move that the House do not agree with this Amendment, making the area of chargeability of any scheme as fixed by the Guardians to be subject to the approval of the Local Government Board, said, the Boards of

Guardians were composed half of elected representatives and half of *ex officios*, practically appointed by the Crown; and he did not see why the House of Lords should object to such a body having the power to fix the area of chargeability as they thought proper. If the Boards of Guardians had not this power, the effect would be disastrous on the prospect of working the Bill. That was shown conclusively in the Tullamore Union, where a scheme of 50 cottages fell through, because the Local Government Board insisted that the area of charge should be the electoral division, the smallest area possible, instead of the dispensary district as fixed by the Guardians. It was most unreasonable that full discretion in the matter should not be left to the Sanitary Authorities.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth disagree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

MR. HEALY said, he would point out that the landlord party had the majority in most of the Unions; and therefore there could not possibly be any objection, from that point of view, of giving this power to the Guardians. The Local Government Board, in these matters, generally acted on the advice of their Inspectors. Now, he supposed one of the most inefficient men in Ireland was Colonel Spaight, the Chief of those Inspectors. ["Oh, oh!"] If a person looked the whole country through, they could not find a more inefficient man. His evidence before the House of Lords showed that, and yet it was to such men, played-out Militiamen and played-out military men, that they were going to entrust this power, instead of to the elected representatives of the ratepayers and those representing the landlords, who knew the requirements of the different localities.

MR. TOTTENHAM said, he hoped that the Government would not give way on this point, and would adhere to the Lords' Amendment.

COLONEL COLTHURST said, that if the choice of the area of charge was to be left to anyone, he did not see any harm in the Local Government Board having power to confirm or reverse the decision of the Guardians. He should prefer that the area of charge was the whole Union.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, it was impossible for the Government to agree with the Lords' Amendment. What had been done in the matter in that House was the result of a long discussion. It was suggested that, for the purposes of this Act, there should be a national rate; and then it was suggested that there should be a Union rate. The Government could not agree to those proposals, and after a long discussion the House felt that a fair solution of the question would be to leave the matter to the discretion of the Sanitary Authority.

COLONEL KING-HARMAN said, that he supposed it was useless for him to discuss the matter after the decision of the Government as stated by the right hon. and learned Gentleman. He wished, however, to deny the statement of the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy) that the elected Guardians were generally in a hopeless minority. Such was not the fact.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Amendments as far as after Clause 19, insert Clauses (A.), (B.), and (C.), read a second time.

Clause (A.) *amended* by inserting after ("lands") in line 8 the words ("in the same locality").

Subsequent Amendments *agreed to.*

Committee *appointed*, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to The Lords for disagreeing to several of the Amendments made by The Lords to the said Bill:"—Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE, Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND, Mr. BOURKE, Sir HENRY HOLLAND, Mr. SOLICITOR GENERAL, Mr. AKERS-DOUGLAS, Mr. SEXTON, Colonel NOLAN, Colonel COLTHURST, and Mr. HEALY:—To withdraw immediately:—Three to be the quorum.

Subsequently,

Reasons for disagreeing to the Lords' Amendments *reported*, and *agreed to.*

To be communicated to the Lords.

EDUCATIONAL ENDOWMENTS (IRELAND) BILL [*Lords*].

(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

[BILL 176.] COMMITTEE.

Order for Committee read.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

Mr. SEXTON asked whether the Government could now state the names of the three Assistant Commissioners to be appointed under the Act? The Chief Commissioners (Lord Justice FitzGibbon and the Right Hon. John Naish, ex-Lord Chancellor) were named in the Bill.

Mr. HEALY said, he hoped that it was not true Dr. Mahaffy was to be appointed Secretary of the Commission, for it was hardly an office he could fill with satisfaction. No person respected more than they did Dr. Mahaffy's abilities; he was a man of high attainments, and a credit to his country; but he was a gentleman who entertained strong opinions upon the matters dealt with in this Bill.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, there was no foundation for the rumour referred to by the hon. and learned Member for Monaghan (Mr. Healy). Of course, Dr. Mahaffy was a man very well qualified for this office; but he was certainly not a gentleman who would be likely to be appointed Secretary of a Commission of this kind, for the simple reason that his position in the literary world placed him far above it. Indeed, the idea had never been suggested that he should. As to the Assistant Commissioners, he (Mr. Holmes) was afraid the Government were not in a position to give the names of the Assistant Commissioners at present, for this reason—that they had not yet communicated with the gentlemen who were eligible for the offices. However, the Bill provided, and care would be taken, that the three gentlemen who would be appointed would be well qualified in educational matters. He thought the House would trust the Government that proper appointments would be made.

Question put, and *agreed to.*

Bill *considered* in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Clause 1 (Interpretation of terms).

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he proposed to omit the words in the clause having reference to an Incorporated Society, there being no such society in Ireland to which the description in the clause would apply. The draftsman appeared to have adopted the words from a Scotch Act passed a few years ago; but they were not applicable to Ireland.

Amendment proposed, in page 1, line 18, to leave out from the word "purposes" to end of line 23.

Amendment *agreed to.*

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, the following Amendment made:—Page 1, line 27, after "thereof," insert "and shall include the Commissioners of Education in Ireland."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 2 (Short title) *agreed to.*

Clause 3 (Commencement of Act).

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General for Ireland the following Amendment made:—Page 2, line 10, leave out "November," and insert "October."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Commissioners.

Clause 4 (Appointment of Commissioners).

Mr. SEXTON said, he thought this would be a convenient time for the right hon. and learned Gentleman to tell the Committee how the new Board would work. As the clause stood in the Bill there were to be three Commissioners, who had equal responsibilities and equal powers; but this clause was to be struck out, and the new Board was to consist of five Members, of whom two were to be Judicial Commissioners, the other three being called Assistant Commissioners. The Right Hon. Gerald FitzGibbon was certainly a gentleman of great experience in the work of education, and one of the Commission upon whose Report the Bill was founded; and, with Ex-Lord Chancellor Naish, he had no reason for doubting that in any jurisdiction they might exercise under this Act they would pay considerable regard to the interest of the Catholic people of Ireland, so long forgotten or neglected in regard to the educational endowments of their country. In no hostile spirit did he comment on these appointments. As to the Assistant Comsioners, it was inconvenient not to have their names, because a scheme of this character would altogether depend upon the persons who were appointed to work it, and his appreciation of the scheme might be favourably affected if he knew the men who would carry it out. How was the work to be divided between the Judicial Commissioners and the Assistant Commissioners? The Judicial Commissioners were to sign every scheme submitted to the Lord Lieutenant, but the others were not to do so; therefore, as to the functions of the Assistant Commissioners, he was left somewhat in the dark; but he supposed they would do something in the preparatory work. But there was a curious and novel line of cleavage between them. It appeared that the Judicial Commissioners, by certificate to the Lord Lieutenant, might override the opinion of the Assistant Commissioners. It was essential, he thought, to have some explanation on this point. Then he observed that the Judicial Commissioners were not to be subject to any personal liability for costs or otherwise in respect of anything done or omitted by them as Commissioners. They would receive no salary—that he supposed was because they had no responsibility, and then there was a curious difference in the tenure of office of the Judicial Commissioners and the Assistant Commissioners, the former holding office during good behaviour, the Assistant Commissioners during the pleasure of the Lord Lieutenant. What was the meaning of that difference? He thought the Assistant Commissioners should have as good a tenure of office as their Judicial Colleagues.

THE CHAIRMAN: I may ask the hon. Gentleman whether it would not be more regular to raise this discussion on the new clause which touches all these points?

MR. SEXTON said, technically it might be so; but he had mentioned them now, and it would save explanation again. The only other observation he had to make was in regard to the power of the Treasury to assign the salaries to the Assistant Commissioners and others. The Treasury were apt, he thought, to starve Irish salaries, and it would be better to have the salaries fixed in the Bill.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, the questions put to him were perfectly reasonable, even if they were not strictly regular, and he thought the Committee would allow him to reply. It would enable them to understand the nature of the changes made in the Bill. As the Bill originally stood, and as it was passed by the House of Lords, there were to be three Commissioners, who would be bound to give their entire time to the discharge of their duties under the Bill. It seemed to the Government, on consideration, that if this arrangement were adhered to, it would be hardly possible to obtain the services of the class of men required for the purpose of framing schemes for the management of endowments in a satisfactory manner. First-rate men could not be obtained, because they were invariably engaged in other affairs; and having regard to the fact that it was a temporary Commission, coming to an end in two years, it would be impossible to secure the services of the class of men required if the original clause were adhered to. It was quite right there should be a certain proportion of paid officials on the Board; but if those gentlemen were allowed to conduct scholastic and educational work, giving a portion of their time to work under the Bill, then he believed they could get the men they desired to have as Assistant Commissioners. The object of the distinction between the Judicial Commissioners and the Assistant Commissioners he would explain. According to the original plan of the Bill, every scheme was subject to the revision of the Court of Chancery upon application of any person affected; and that, of course, would throw considerable expense on the Board, the matter being argued by counsel on either side in long and elaborate discussion. On the whole, the Government did not think that would be a satisfactory way of arranging matters. They thought it better to have the decision of distinguished men of legal experience and knowledge of educational wants, who would not be required to give up their whole time, and through them, in the first instance, schemes would be presented. The two unpaid Judicial Commissioners would take the place of the Court of Chancery; by signing their names they would give their sanction; and in the new clause it would be provided that no scheme should be brought before the Lord Lieutenant in Council for approval without the signatures of the two Judicial Commissioners. The division of labour between the two classes of Commissioners would amount to this—the scheme, so far as it dealt with educational matters, would be prepared by the Assistant Commissioners; it would then be brought before the Judicial Commissioners, who would look at it as lawyers having regard to the interests of all classes, and they, being gentlemen of high educational endowments, would be enabled to revise, in any material respect, the schemes submitted to them; then, on their high authority, and with their signatures as proof of their sanction, the scheme would be brought before the notice of the Lord Lieutenant in Council. That was how the Commission would work, and would show why, in the new clause, two classes of Commissioners were provided. He was not in a position to give the names of the Assistant Commissioners; but he thought the names of the Judicial Commissioners would indicate the lines upon which the appointments would be made. He regretted that he could not give the names. For his not doing so there were two causes—first, the difficulty of communicating with fit and proper persons within the short time the Government had had for the purpose; and, secondly, the illness of the Viceroy for the last day or two; but he trusted the names would be made known in a very short time. As to the responsibilities that were not to attach to the Judicial Commissioners, he thought it better that the words should apply to the whole body of Commissioners. With regard to the tenure of office of the Assistant Commissioners, it was usual in offices of that character, and he did not like to set a different precedent. Of course, having regard to the high position of the Judicial Commissioners, they ought not to be liable to removal at a moment's notice by the Lord Lieutenant.

Mr. HEALY said, he had no doubt the Government would do their best to make the Act work well. He hoped they would avoid imitating the appointments made under the Intermediate Education Act, or grafting on any paid official from that Board to this new Board. They were gentlemen whose conduct had been frequently questioned in that House, not so scrupulously as was intended, but several questions had been asked. He trusted they would take nobody officially connected with the Education Board, like Mr. Crouch and others; to do so would only give rise to additional discontent.

Mr. SEXTON said, if it was the usual course for Assistant Commissioners to hold office during the pleasure of the Lord Lieutenant he did not object; but had it been consonant with usage he should have preferred that all should hold office during good behaviour.

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General for Ireland Clause *omitted.*

Clause 5 (Powers of Commissioners).

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General for Ireland the following Amendment made:—Page 2, line 43, after "or," insert ("in the case of endowments applicable for intermediate education").

Amendment proposed, in page 3, line 4, to leave out the word "solely."—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, he did not quite understand why the word should be struck out. There was no intention to divert endowments from their purpose.

Mr. SEXTON said, the word was no doubt uselessly introduced.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, the word was technically correct according to the original reading of the clause, which provided for the transfer of elementary education endowments to the Commissioners of National Education; but on consideration the Government did not think that was desirable; and the only provision now proposed was that such endowments should be subject to the inspection of the National Board.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment proposed,

In page 3, line 4, after the word "education," to leave out the words "transferring such endowments to," and insert "placing the schools under the inspection and control of."—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

Mr. SEXTON said, while he was willing to allow the Commissioners of National Education in such cases the power of inspection, the words "inspection and control" conferred too much power. "Control" should be omitted.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, to leave out the words "and control."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General for Ireland the following Amendments made:—Page 3, line 5, leave out from "education," to end of line 6; line 13, after first "governing bodies," insert "or transferring endowments from one governing body to another;" line 15, at end, add "or vesting endowments in any existing corporate bodies in trust for such governing bodies;" line 16, after "sell," insert "demise;" line 21, after "sales," insert "demises."

Mr. HEALY said, this clause dealt with investments, and it was natural those would be made through the Bank of Ireland. Though he was not raising objection upon this point now, it was right it should be understood that in future any Government Bills coming before the House and dealing with investments would be closely criticized, and, if necessary, opposed; and this institution must sooner or later pass under considerable changes, and it would be well, until those were effected, to use some other medium not so likely soon to form the subject of stringent inquiry and discussion.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 6 (Scope of Commission).

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, the object of this clause, apart from the reference to Industrial Museums and Libraries, was, as far as possible, to keep endowments to localities; but, on consideration, he thought that thereby the action of the Commission would be unduly restricted, and an endowment, however valuable in itself, might be deprived of its full value. As to Industrial Museums and Libraries, however valuable as adjuncts, they were not educational institutions in the ordinary sense of the term.

Amendment proposed, to leave out the Clause.—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause *omitted.*

Endowments subject to Commission.

Clause 7 (Act not to apply to certain endowments).

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General for Ireland the following Amendment made:—Page 4, line 8, leave out from "be," to "given," in line 11.

Amendment proposed,

In page 4, line 13, at end of line, insert as new sub-sections—(5.) "Or to any endowment consisting of voluntary subscriptions, or accumulations, or investments thereof; or (6) To any endowment applicable exclusively for the benefit of persons of any particular religious denomination, and which is under the exclusive control of persons of that denomination."—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

Question proposed, "That the new sub-sections be there inserted."

Mr. SEXTON said, he did not think "applicable" was quite the right word to use. Money used in one direction for many years might from use be applicable. "Provided," or "intended exclusively," would be better.

Amendment proposed to the said proposed Amendment, after the word "exclusively," add the words "and provided."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Amendment *agreed to.*

Amendment, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 8 (Apportionment of mixed endowments).

Mr. SEXTON asked what was the meaning of the words "other charitable uses," where any part of an educational endowment within the meaning of the Act was applied to other purposes? Was it held that education was a charitable purpose?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, it had been held so again and again.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 9 (Application to education of non-educational endowments).

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General for Ireland the following Amendment made:—Page 5, line 33, at end add—

"The Commissioners, with the consent of the Commissioners of Education in Ireland, may by any scheme or schemes under this Act confer upon the said Commissioners of Education all or any such further, additional, or amended powers as may appear necessary or expedient for the management and control of the endowments vested in or controlled by the said Commissioners of Education, or for the efficient exercise of the powers of the said Commissioners."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 10 (Endowments for apprenticeship fees, maintenance, and clothing, to be deemed educational).

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND the following Amendment made:—Page 6, line 2, after "fees," insert "or for marriage portions;" line 4, after "children," insert "or young persons."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Requisites of Schemes.

Clause 11 (Vested interests) *agreed to.*

Clause 12 (Interests acquired after passing of Act).

MR. SEXTON said, he would direct the right hon. and learned Gentleman's attention to the language of line 32—

> "But this provision shall not prevent them (the Governing Body) from continuing any works begun before the passing of this Act, or from doing anything necessary for the repair or maintenance of buildings or residences existing at the passing of this Act."

The Governing Body might have applied their funds to building or enlarging of schools—the work might have just commenced—he did not see why they should be allowed to continue such, or to maintain buildings that might be put to better use, or were quite unsuited to their purpose. He would propose to omit the words "containing any works begun before the passing of this Act, or——"

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, it would have a most unsatisfactory result to omit these words. As soon as the Act became law no new work would be commenced; but if the work was actually begun it would be a most unsatisfactory thing to leave it unfinished. Besides, the Governing Body would be liable for breaches of contract.

MR. SEXTON said, then perhaps the words "under contract" after "begun" might be inserted.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, suppose a house had been half built under contract or not, it would be a most unsatisfactory thing that the house should not be allowed to be finished.

MR. SEXTON said, but suppose they had just dug out the foundations of an expensive building of which the Commissioners could not approve, was it best to allow the Governing Body to go on spending hundreds of pounds in a way the Commissioners did not approve?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he thought the Governing Bodies might be left to their discretion so far.

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 13 (Interests of particular classes to be kept in view).

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND the following Amendment made:—Page 7, line 4, after "generally," insert "or of a particular class."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 14 (Selection of beneficiaries) *agreed to.*

Clause 15 (Benefits to be extended to girls).

Amendment proposed, in page 7, line 13, after the word "made," to insert the words "if the amount of the endowment will admit."—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

MR. THOMASSON said, this seemed to him to weaken the effect of the clause unnecessarily. The clause provided that the benefits of the Act should be extended, as far as possible, to both sexes; and the words of the clause followed those of the Scotch Act, which did not contain the words now proposed to be inserted, and which he thought not in any way necessary. The provision for an equitable arrangement as far as possible under local circumstances between the sexes was all that was necessary.

MR. WOODALL said, he would join in the protest against the limitation which the insertion of the words in the clause would seem to imply.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he did not think they would very much matter. If the endowment did not provide the means, necessarily the arrangement could not be made.

Mr. ARTHUR ARNOLD said, if the words were unimportant then they should be omitted. He could understand that they might be construed so as to be very objectionable.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause *agreed to.*

Clause 16 (Tenure of office of teachers, &c.)

Colonel NOLAN said, he thought the language of this clause was a little too strong. It provided for the dismissal at pleasure of every officer or teacher under the Governing Body, and he thought the words "at pleasure" might be omitted. Let the power of summary dismissal remain; but let the officer or teacher have the right to appeal to a Court of Law should he feel aggrieved.

Amendment proposed, in page 7, line 18, to leave out the words "at pleasure." —(*Colonel Nolan.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Colonel KING-HARMAN said, there was another point in connection with the power of dismissal; he did not see why, in preparing schemes, the Commissioners should not have power of compensating those whose interests would be affected.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, there was a clause in the Bill providing for that.

Mr. HEALY said, he would point out that lower down in the 17th clause there was a provision for the appointment of a public Inspector—as to which he would have something to say later on —what he had to suggest now was that the wording of the clause—

> "Every teacher and officer in the endowed school or schools"

would not include the Inspector. There was no power to dismiss him. It might be a very nice legal point whether the Inspector was included among the officers.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, Clause 16 dealt with a different subject-matter to Clause 17. The officers referred to under Clause 16 were the officers of the Governing Body. The Commissioners would not have the power of dismissal in themselves; they would merely make and arrange the scheme which the Governing Body would carry out. The Inspector, under Clause 17, would be an officer appointed by the Lord Lieutenant, and liable to dismissal by him.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 17 (Inspection and audit).

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he did not move the first of his Amendments on the Paper to this clause.

Mr. HEALY thought it would be well to give the power of appointing Inspectors to the Commissioners of National Education as well as to the Lord Lieutenant.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, the objection to that was that it would not be well to give the power to temporary Commissioners, who would cease to hold office at the end of three years.

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General for Ireland the following Amendment made:—Page 7, line 28, after "Board," insert "or other competent authority."

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) moved, in page 7, line 28, to leave out from "scheme," to "and," in line 31, and insert "the expense of such inspection and audit."

Mr. SEXTON said, that if those words were left out there would be no security in the Bill in regard to the remuneration of these Inspectors, or for the presentation of Reports to the public authorities.

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes), after all, did not think there was any objection to the words, and would withdraw his Amendment.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General for Ireland the following Amendment made:—Page 7, line 31, leave out from "endowments," to end of Clause, and insert "as the scheme may provide."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 18 (Provision for future alteration of schemes).

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND the following Amendment made:—Page 7, line 42, leave out "with the consent of the Lord Lieutenant."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 19 to 21, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 22 (Governing body may lodge objections).

MR. SEXTON said, that before the right hon. and learned Gentleman the Attorney General for Ireland moved his Amendment to this clause he wished to ask him whether he thought that one Commissioner would be sufficient to hold these local public inquiries concerning the subject-matter of schemes? Would it not be better to say "two or more?"

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he had no objection to that. He would move to leave out the words "one or two," and insert "two or more."

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 23 (As to framing of schemes).

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND the following Amendments made:—Page 8, line 33, after "or," leave out "two," and insert "more;" after "the," insert "judicial."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 24 (Approval of Lord Lieutenant to schemes).

Amendment proposed,

In page 9, line 11, to leave out from "months," to "the," in line 13.—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

Question proposed, "That the words proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

MR. SEXTON wished to know whether, after the scheme was drawn up, the Sub-Commissioners had no further concern with it?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, he did not think that at all. The Assistant Commissioners would assist until the matter was completed.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause 25 (Proceedings where scheme is remitted).

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND the following Amendment made:—Page 9, line 38, after "the," insert "judicial."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 26 (Quorum of Governing Body) *agreed to.*

Clause 27 (Petition to Chancery Division on questions of law).

Amendment proposed, to leave out the Clause.—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

COLONEL KING-HARMAN could not understand why the right hon. and learned Gentleman wanted to leave out this and the next clause.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, that these clauses were very proper ones under the original scheme; but having appointed two Head Commissioners it seemed to him that it would embarrass the authorities without necessity if they put them to the expense of these additional appeals from two of the most eminent Judges in Ireland.

MR. SEXTON said, he should have thought the hon. and gallant Gentleman had got all the appeals he wanted in the Labourers' Act.

Amendment *agreed to.*

Clause *omitted.*

Clause 28 (Judgment of Court final. Costs).

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND Clause *omitted.*

Clauses 29 to 33, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 34 (Cost of publishing scheme, &c.)

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND the following Amendment made:—Page 12, line 12, after "cost," leave out "of," and insert "incurred by or under the direction of the Commissioners in."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) moved, in page 12, line 13, to leave out from "Act" to "shall," in line 15, and insert—

"Shall be part of the expenses incurred under this Act, and any cost properly and necessarily incurred by any governing body under this Act."

Mr. SEXTON said, he saw the words "*Dublin Gazette*" in the words the right hon. and learned Gentleman proposed to leave out. It appeared to him that by means of this Amendment the right hon. and learned Gentleman was attempting to slide the expenses of *The Dublin Gazette* into the expenses under this Act. The words should be left as they were.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clauses 35 to 37, inclusive, *agreed to.*

Clause 38 (Returns, &c. by governing body).

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General for Ireland the following Amendments made:—Page 13, line 2, after Lord Lieutenant," insert "or otherwise;" line 3, after "require," insert "or as any scheme framed under this Act may direct."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 39 (Provision for default of governing body).

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General for Ireland, the following Amendments made:—Page 13, line 6, after "Lord Lieutenant," leave out "upon the application of," and insert "or for;" line 8, after "Ireland," leave out "or;" line 13, after "of," leave out "the," and insert "any;" line 13, leave out from "Act," to "to," in line 14.

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

Clause 40 (Duration of powers of making schemes).

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) moved in page 13, line 23, to leave out "seven," and insert "eight." The object of this was to extend the duration of the powers of making and approving of a scheme under this Act from 1887 to 1888.

Amendment proposed, in page 13, line 23, to leave out the word "seven," and insert the word "eight."—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

Question proposed, "That the word proposed to be left out stand part of the Clause."

Mr. SEXTON wished to ask the Attorney General for Ireland whether he had fully considered this matter; and whether he thought that three years would be sufficient to complete all the operations under this Act?

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) said, he thought that the 31st of December, 1888, would give them quite sufficient time, because there was a provision in the Bill that if a scheme was commenced by that date, but not carried out, it might even then be completed.

Amendment *agreed to.*

On Motion of Mr. Attorney General for Ireland the following Amendment made:—Page 13, line 26, at end, add—

"Upon the expiration of the said powers the office of the commissioners, and of their secretary, officers, and clerks shall cease; and no assistant commissioner, secretary, officer, or clerk, appointed under this Act, shall, by reason of such appointment, be entitled to any compensation, superannuation, or other allowance in respect of his office."

Clause, as amended, *agreed to.*

The ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (Mr. Holmes) moved, in page 2, after Clause 3, to insert the following Clauses:—

"The Commissioners shall be five in number, of whom two (hereinafter referred to as the Judicial Commissioners) shall be or have been Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ireland, and three (hereinafter referred to as Assistant Commissioners) shall be persons of experience in education.

"The Right honourable Gerald FitzGibbon and the Right honourable John Naish are hereby constituted the first Judicial Commissioners.

"The Judicial Commissioners shall hold office during good behaviour, they shall receive no payment for their services, and shall not be subjected to any personal liability for costs or otherwise in respect of anything done or omitted by them as such Commissioners.

"Every scheme submitted for the approval of the Lord Lieutenant in Council under this Act shall be signed by both the Judicial Commissioners for the time being under their hands.

"It shall be lawful for the Lord Lieutenant to appoint the Assistant Commissioners, who shall hold office during his pleasure; and, upon any vacancy occurring by death, resignation, or otherwise in the office of a Judicial or Assistant Commissioner, it shall be lawful for the Lord Lieutenant to supply such vacancy by the appointment of a qualified person.

"The Judicial Commissioners may from time to time, with the approval of the Commissioners of the Treasury, appoint a secretary, and such officers, clerks, and servants as they think fit.

"The Judicial Commissioners may from time to time prescribe the duties of the Assistant Commissioners and of the secretary, officers, clerks, and servants.

"The Commissioners of Public Works in Ireland shall provide a suitable office in Dublin in which the business of the Commission may be transacted.

"This section shall take effect on the passing of this Act.

"The Commissioners of the Treasury shall assign such salaries as they think fit to the Assistant Commissioners, secretary, officers, clerks, and servants appointed under this Act, and, except where otherwise provided, the salaries and other expenses incurred under this Act (including the personal and travelling expenses of the Judicial Commissioners, and the travelling expenses of the Assistant Commissioners, secretary, and other officers incurred on the business of the Commission, which shall be paid on scales to be approved by the Treasury), and also any expenses incurred by the Lord Lieutenant in Council under this Act, shall be paid out of moneys to be provided by Parliament."

New Clauses (Constitution of Commission) (Salaries and expenses,)—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland,*)—*brought up*, and read the first and second time.

MR. SEXTON said, that perhaps the right hon. and learned Gentleman would say something further as to the tenure of the office of the Assistant Commissioners, and perhaps, also, there would be no objection to his mentioning the minimum salary which would be paid to those Assistant Commissioners. It was very important that the three Assistant Commissioners under this Act should be high officials, and it was impossible for them to perform those difficult and important duties without they were in receipt of an efficient salary; and, therefore, it would be as well if the Government could mention the minimum salary. They did not like to be left in the dark on this matter.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) pointed out that in the clause he had moved the tenure of office of the Commissioners was dealt with by leaving the matter subject to the pleasure of the Lord Lieutenant. With regard to the other point, he would point out that they had already completed Supply; and, besides that, in order to mention the salary in the Bill, it would be necessary to recommit it, and they could not do that at that late period of the Session. As far as the Irish Executive were concerned, they would urge on the Treasury the necessity of giving good salaries.

MR. SEXTON asked if the right hon. and learned Gentleman could say what salaries the Irish Government intended to give?

The Attorney General for Ireland

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, that was impossible, for they could only make a representation to the Treasury.

MR. HEALY said, that then what would happen was this—that they would go about trying to get men at low salaries. He hoped they would not deal with this matter in an ungenerous spirit.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY FOR IRELAND (Sir WILLIAM HART DYKE) said, the Government had no such desire.

THE SECRETARY TO THE TREASURY (Sir HENRY HOLLAND) said, it was quite impossible for him to make any statement on the subject, except that the Treasury would be pleased to consider any recommendation made by the Irish Government.

Clause *agreed to*, and *added* to the Bill.

Preamble.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this be the Preamble of the Bill."

MR. SEXTON said, he did not think the Preamble was sufficiently comprehensive. It spoke of the desirability of giving a chance to boys and girls of promise; but he would move to strike out all the words after the word "Ireland," and insert "by applying them to the more general benefit of the people."

Amendment proposed,

In page 1, line 2, after the word "Ireland," to insert the words "by applying them to the more general benefit of the people."—(*Mr. Sexton.*)

Question proposed, "That those words be there inserted."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) said, it appeared to him that there was no great virtue in Preambles; and he would move to leave out all the words after the word "Ireland."

MR. SEXTON asked whether the right hon. and learned Gentleman would not accept his words?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES): No, Sir; I cannot accept them.

Amendment, by leave, *withdrawn.*

On Motion of Mr. ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND the following Amendment made:—In page 1, line 2, to leave out all the words after "Ireland."

COLONEL COLTHURST wished to call attention to an omission in the Amendment proposed that afternoon, which might turn out to be an important matter.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) asked the hon. and gallant Member to confer with him before Report, and he would consider the matter.

Bill *reported.*

MR. HEALY suggested that they might take the Report now.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES) was afraid they could not do so in consequence of the Money Clauses.

Bill, as amended, to be considered *To-morrow.*

EDUCATIONAL ENDOWMENTS (IRELAND) [SALARIES AND EXPENSES].

Considered in Committee.

(In the Committee.)

Resolved, That it is expedient to authorise the payment, out of moneys to be provided by Parliament, of the Salaries and Expenses of Commissioners, Assistant Commissioners, Secretary, and other Officers, as well as any Expenses incurred by the Lord Lieutenant in Council, which may become payable under the provisions of any Act of the present Session for re-organising the Educational Endowments of Ireland.

Resolution to be reported *To-morrow.*

POOR LAW UNIONS' OFFICERS (IRELAND) BILL.—[BILL 262.]

(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

CONSIDERATION OF LORDS' AMENDMENT.

Lords' Amendment *considered.*

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR IRELAND (Mr. HOLMES), in moving that the House do agree with the Lords in the said Amendment, said, that he must confess he could not see why it was made, for the effect would be the same, whether it were in the Bill or not. The Amendment provided that any rights which the officers had should not be affected by the Bill, and they would not be affected in any case.

Motion made, and Question proposed, "That this House doth agree with the Lords in the said Amendment."—(*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.*)

MR. SEXTON said, he thought the Amendment was ill-considered, ill-drawn, and absurd. The Bill was merely a Pension Bill; yet this Amendment declared that, notwithstanding anything contained in the Act, the right and title of officers to salary should not be affected. Had the right hon. Gentleman noticed that word "salary?" The Irish Medical Officers' Association, which said nothing while the Bill was passing through the House, when the Bill had gone up to the Lords went furtively to the noble Marquess in charge of it, and induced him to introduce this clause. He had a communication from the Poor Law officers stating that the Medical Officers' Association had no authority whatever to proceed in this matter.

MR. HEALY said, his hon. Friend (Mr. Sexton) had laid his finger on an evil practice, and that was the system under which they were tied in discussing Lords' Amendments by the fact of the Speaker being in the Chair. If this went on much longer, it would be necessary, in the threatened New Rules, to provide that the Lords' Amendments should be considered in a Committee and a Report stage. It was very unfair that when Members of that House agreed to a certain course, and the Lords put in an Amendment, that they, the Commons, should be throttled by having to discuss the Lords' Amendments with the Speaker in the Chair.

Motion, by leave, *withdrawn.*

On the Motion of Mr. SEXTON, the said Lords' Amendment *amended* by leaving out the word "salary," and *agreed to.*

ADJOURNMENT—ROYAL COMMISSION ON THE DEPRESSION OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY—CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMISSION.—OBSERVATIONS.

MR. BROADHURST, in rising to call attention to the constitution of the Royal Commission of Inquiry into the condition of Trade and Industry, said, he wished only to make a few observations on the subject; and at the outset he might say that his complaint was not based upon political grounds. With the composition of the Commission, so far as it consisted of Tories, or Radicals, or the advocates of Free Trade or Fair Trade, he had nothing to do; but he thought he had great cause to complain, representing as he did the Trade Union Congress, of the almost entire exclusion of labour from the composition of the Commission. A subject which would inevitably come up for inquiry and consideration to a very great extent in a Commission of the kind was a question of restrictive laws on labour. The Employers' Liability Act, the Factories Act, the Factories Inspection Act, the Mines Regulation Act, and Education Act—all those questions must of necessity be inquired into for the purpose of comparison with the manufacturing nations of the Continent, such as France, Belgium, Switzerland, and Germany, in order to see how far labour and production were restricted by the operation of these laws in this country as against similar laws in the countries he had mentioned. Then would follow a comparison as to the working hours, the rate of wages, and, in all probability, the action of trade unions upon the productive freedom of the country. All these subjects formed questions of the deepest and most vital interest to the organized trades of the country; and he contended that in any Commission to inquire into the trade of the country labour ought to be adequately represented. He contended that the interests of labour were far more nearly concerned in an inquiry of this sort than the interests of capital, and that, if not on an equality, at least they should have been represented by far more than two Members. Lord Iddesleigh, however, by no means took that view. He had not a word to say against the nomination of Mr. Birtwhistle, though he was on the opposite side of politics to himself. He had, however, lately learned that the noble Lord had addressed a communication to Mr. Burnett, Secretary to the Amalgamated Society of Engineers.

Notice taken, that 40 Members were not present; House counted, and 40 Members not being present,

House adjourned at five minutes after Seven o'clock.

[INDEX.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, 22, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

INDEX

TO

HANSARD'S PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES.

VOLUME CCC.

EIGHTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1884 - 5.

Explanation of the Abbreviations.

Bills, Read 1^{o}, 2^{o}, 3^{o}, or 1^{a}, 2^{a}, 3^{a}, Read the First, Second, or Third Time.—In Speeches, 1R., 2R., 3R., Speech delivered on the First, Second, or Third Reading.—*Amendt.*, Amendment.—*Res.*, Resolution.—*Comm.*, Committee.—*Re-Comm.*, Re-Committal.—*Rep.*, Report.—*Consid.*, Consideration.—*Adj.*, Adjournment or Adjourned.—*cl.*, Clause.—*add. cl.*, Additional Clause.—*neg.*, Negatived.—*M. Q.*, Main Question.—*O. Q.*, Original Question.—*O. M.*, Original Motion.—*P. Q.*, Previous Question.—R. P., Report Progress.—*A.*, Ayes.—*N.*, Noes.—*M.*, Majority.—*1st. Div.*, *2nd. Div.*, First or Second Division.—*l.*, Lords.—*c.*, Commons.

When in this Index a * is added to the Reading of a Bill, it indicates that no Debate took place upon that stage of the measure.

When in the Text or in the Index a Speech is marked thus*, it indicates that the Speech is reprinted from a Pamphlet or some authorized Report.

When in the Index a † is prefixed to a Name or an Office (the Member having accepted or vacated office during the Session) and to Subjects of Debate thereunder, it indicates that the Speeches on those Subjects were delivered in the speaker's private or official character, as the case may be.

Some subjects of debate have been classified under the following "General Headings:"—ARMY—NAVY—INDIA—IRELAND—SCOTLAND—PARLIAMENT—POOR LAW—POST OFFICE—METROPOLIS—CHURCH OF ENGLAND—EDUCATION—CRIMINAL LAW—LAW AND JUSTICE—TAXATION, under WAYS AND MEANS.

ABINGDON, Earl of
River Thames (No. 2), Report, *cl.* 4, Amendt. 813; *cl.* 6, 814, 815

ACKERS, Mr. B. St. John, *Gloucestershire, W.*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 613, 616, 617; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 751

ACLAND, Mr. C. T. D., *Cornwall, E. Div.*
Endowed Schools — Alderman Dauntsey's Charity (West Lavington), 1573

ADMIRALTY—First Lord (*see* HAMILTON, Right Hon. Lord G. F.)

ADMIRALTY—Civil Lord (*see* ASHMEAD-BARTLETT, Mr. E.)

ADMIRALTY—Secretary to (*see* RITCHIE, Mr. C. T.)

Africa (*East Coast*)
German Annexations at Zanzibar, Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *Aug* 7, 1455; *Aug* 10, 1576

Africa (*South*)
Basutoland, Questions, Sir Robert Fowler; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Colonel Stanley) *July* 27, 56
The Boers—Attack on Mr. J. Donaldson, Withdrawal of Question, Sir Frederick Milner *Aug* 6, 1282

AGNEW, Mr. W., *Lancashire, S.E.*
Worcester Extension, Lords Amendts. Consid. *cl.* 21 A, 665

Agricultural Holdings (England)—The Bethell Charity Trustees of Newark and Mr. R. Robinson
Question, Mr. Warton; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 6, 1268

Alkali, &c. Works Regulation Acts—Gas Works
Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 3, 820

Allen, Mr. W. S., *Newcastle-on-Tyne*
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *add. cl.* 1397

Allotments Extension Act, 1882
Folkestone Charity Land, Questions, Mr. Jesse Collings, Sir Edward Watkin; Answers, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 11, 1737
Lady Isabella Dodd's Charity, Ellesborough, Bucks, Question, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 4, 1044

Ardilaun, Lord
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Report, *add. cl.* 1430

Argyll, Duke of
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 2R. 229, 230

Army (*Miscellaneous Questions*)
Alleged Unpopularity, Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 10, 1577
Army Education—The Staff College—Oriental Languages, Question, Colonel Milne-Home; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *July* 27, 52
Army Medical Service, Question, Mr. Beresford; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 3, 821
Glencorse Military Prison, Question, Observations, The Marquess of Lothian; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for War (Viscount Bury) *July* 28, 212
Gunnery Experiments with Dynamite, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *July* 31, 672
Line Battalions on Foreign Service—The Royal Irish and the East Surrey, Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 3, 839
The 2nd East Surrey Regiment, Question, Mr. Francis Buxton; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 6, 1275
Military Expedition to the Soudan—Widows of Soldiers, Question, Mr. Giles; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Department (Mr. H. S. Northcote) *Aug* 11, 1733

[*cont.*

Army—*cont.*
Military Farms at Aldershot, Question, Sir Arthur Hayter; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 10, 1577
Quartermasters and Riding Masters—Promotion, Question, Mr. Causton; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 6, 1277
Railways in Time of War, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 7, 1456
Royal Military Academy, Woolwich—Meal Hours of Cadets, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 3, 832
The Clothing Department—Military Temporary Clerks, Question, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answer, The Financial Secretary to the War Department (Mr. H. S. Northcote) *Aug* 7, 1457
Limerick Army Clothing Factory, Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Guy Dawnay) *Aug* 7, 1458
The Commissariat Staff—The Royal Marines, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Ritchie) *Aug* 10, 1577
The Guards—Fatal Accident at Caterham Ranges, Question, Dr. Farquharson; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *July* 27, 55
Wire Gun Construction, Questions, Mr. Gray; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *July* 27, 48

Ordnance Department
Field Artillery and Small Arms, Question, Observations, The Earl of Wemyss; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Dunraven) *Aug* 10, 1525
Small Arm Ammunition—The Boxer Cartridge, Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 4, 1041
Widow of Mr. Frederick Rance, Question, Mr. Boord; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Guy Dawnay) *July* 31, 675
Woolwich Arsenal, Question, Mr. Boord; Answer, The Surveyor General of Ordnance (Mr. Guy Dawnay) *Aug* 6, 1279

Auxiliary Forces
The Army Reserve, Question, Mr. Harris; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 11, 1730
Reserve Men—Service with the Colours, Question, Observations, The Marquess of Lothian; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Dunraven) *Aug* 10, 1545

The 4th Royal Irish Fusiliers (*Cavan Militia*) — *Major Lionel Brooke*, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 3, 819; Questions, Mr. Biggar, Colonel King-Harman; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 7, 1449

[*cont.*

ARMY—*Auxiliary Forces*—cont.
The Northampton Volunteers, Questions, Lord Burghley, Sir Arthur Hayter; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 6, 1278

ARNOLD, Mr. A., *Salford*
Africa (East Coast) — German Annexation at Zanzibar, 1455, 1576
Army Estimates—War Office, 170
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1236, 1239
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 731
Depression of Trade and Industry, Royal Commission on, 62, 513;—Names of Commissioners, 823, 1453, 1579, 1580, 1726
Ecclesiastical Commissioners — Taxation of Legal Expenses, 511
Educational Endowments (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 15, 1905
Egypt—International Guaranteed Loan, 525, 670, 671;—Correspondence, 846
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. 1748; *cl.* 3, 1776, 1777, 1779, 1810; Motion for reporting Progress, 1820; *cl.* 14, 1830; Consid. *cl.* 3, 1888
Ramsden Estate, 3R. 1034, 1036; Amendt. 1197, 1198
Sunderland Corporation, Lords Amendts. Consid. Amendt. 1033
Supply—Temporary Commissions and Committees, &c. 177

Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Act, 1882—*Case of Mr. Templeman, Agent to Mr. S. C. Armstrong*
Question, Mr. Biggar; Answers, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners), The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 3, 825

Artillery and Rifle Ranges Bill
(*Viscount Bury*)
l. Read 3ª * *July* 27 (No. 193)
Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 36]

ASHBOURNE, Lord (Lord Chancellor of Ireland)
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Commons Reasons Consid. 1711, 1714

ASHER, Mr. A., *Elgin Burghs*
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 4, 1471
Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 1176, 1179; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1184; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1186, 1187, 1188; *add. cl.* 1191, 1192; Consid. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1509; *cl.* 8, 1510
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. *cl.* 5, 1137, 1143
Supply (Supplementary Estimate) — Peterhead Harbour, 185

ASHLEY, Hon. E. M., *Isle of Wight*
Supply—South Africa and St. Helena, 458

ASHMEAD-BARTLETT, Mr. E. (Civil Lord of the Admiralty), *Eye*
Navy — Evolutionary Squadron — Torpedo Crows, 515

ATKINSON, Mr. H. J., *Lincoln, N.*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 5, 774
Depression of Trade and Industry, Royal Commission on, 62
Marriage Law — Attendance of Registrars, 1039
Royal Commission on Loss of Life at Sea—Evidence, 841, 1060
Worcester Extension, Lords Amendts. Consid. *cl.* 21 A, 662

ATTORNEY GENERAL (*see* WEBSTER, Sir R. E.)

ATTORNEY GENERAL for IRELAND (*see* HOLMES, Right Hon. H.)

AYLMER, Captain J. E. F., *Maidstone*
Army Estimates—Warlike Stores, 130, 132
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 5, 1483
India — East India Revenue Accounts — Annual Financial Statement, Comm. 1341
Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1098; Comm. *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1685, 1686

BALFOUR, Lord
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 2R. 220; Comm. *add. cl.* 498, 500

BALFOUR, Right Hon. A. J. (President of the Local Government Board), *Hertford*
Alkali, &c. Works Regulation Acts — Gas Works, 820
Housing of the Working Classes (England), 522; 2R. 1617; Comm. 1752; *cl.* 1, 1762, 1764; *cl.* 3, 1783; *cl.* 14, 1830; *add. cl.* 1839
Lunacy Acts Amendment, 2R. 208; Comm. 383
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal—Supplementary Lists, 1284
Parliament—Business of the House, 1584, 1585
Parliamentary Elections — Registration of Voters—Alleged Misconduct of Volunteers, 246
Parliamentary Voters—Registration of Voters in Agricultural Districts, 1568
Poor Law (England and Wales)—Conway Union—Mr. Davies, Medical Officer, 247
  Hungerford Board of Guardians—Appointment of Master and Matron for the Workhouse, 1061
Public Health—Questions
  Cholera in Spain, 522, 1283
  Metropolis—Contamination of the River Lea, 1064, 1457
  River Thames—Purification of Sewage, 1282, 1573
Registration of Voters (England)—List of Voters, Willesden, 1731
Registration (Supplementary) Lists, 1581

[cont,

Balfour, Right Hon. A. J.—*cont.*
Sea Fisheries Scotland Amendment, 2R. 203
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. 971; *cl.* 5, 1142, 1144, 1145, 1146, 1150, 1151; *cl.* 6, 1163, 1167
Supply—Disturnpiked and Main Roads in England and Wales, 381
Valuation (Metropolis) Act, 1869—Appeals against Assessments, 1870

Balfour, Right Hon. J. B., *Clackmannan, &c.*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* 915; Schedule, 921
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), Comm. Schedule, Amendt. 207
Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 1174; *cl.* 7, 1186
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. 947; *cl.* 3, 1127; *cl.* 5, 1151; *cl.* 6, 1164, 1165; *add. cl.* 1171; Schedule, 1172

Balfour, General Sir G., *Kincardineshire*
Alkali, &c. Works Regulation Acts — Gas Works, 820
Army Estimates—Warlike Stores, 128
India — East India Revenue Accounts — Annual Financial Statement, 676; Comm. 1323, 1360
Land Purchase (Ireland), 1452
Metropolitan Water Companies, 1738
Parliament—Business of the House, 1583
Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1174; *cl.* 4, 1181; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1184, 1185

Bank Charter Act, 1845 — *The Irish Banks—Note Issue*
Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 30, 508

Bankruptcy (Office Accommodation) Bill
(*Earl of Iddesleigh*)
l. Read 2ª* *July* 28 (No. 191)
Committee*; Report *July* 30
Read 3ª* *July* 31
Royal Assent *Aug* 4 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 47]

Barclay, Mr. J. W., *Forfarshire*
Army Estimates—Provisions, Forage, &c. 103, 105

Baring, Mr. T. C., *Essex, S.*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 726

Barttelot, Colonel Sir W. B., *Sussex, W.*
Army—Alleged Unpopularity, 1577
Army Estimates — Clothing Establishments, &c. 116
  Military Education, 149
  Provisions, Forage, &c. 83
  Superannuation Allowances, 174
  Warlike Stores, 125
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 764
[*cont.*

Barttelot, Colonel Sir W. B.—*cont.*
Egypt—Soudan—Battle of Abu Klea, 839, 1055
  Garrison of Kassala, 64
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 2, 1789; *cl.* 14, 1831, 1834, 1835
Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* 1699; Consid. *add. cl.* 1842
Public Health—The Cholera, 1282

Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks- (Chancellor of the Exchequer), *Gloucestershire, E.*
Asia (Central)—Russia and Afghanistan—The "Penjdeh Incident," 1267, 1564
Bank Charter Act, 1845 — The Irish Banks—Note Issue, 508
Civil Service — Lower Division Clerks and Writers, 1734
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1203, 1208, 1215, 1220
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, 630; *cl.* 12, 804; Consid. *cl.* 9, 1502
Customs and Inland Revenue (No. 2), Consid. *cl.* 20, 194; Amendt. 195; *cl.* 25, Amendt. *ib.*
Depression of Trade and Industry, Royal Commission on, 62, 514;—Names of Commissioners, 823, 824, 1285, 1453, 1579, 1580, 1726, 1727
Earldom of Mar Restitution, 1R. 684
Egypt—International Guaranteed Loan, 517, 518, 524, 525
  Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff, 66, 241, 242
Egypt—Soudan Expedition — Vote of Thanks to Her Majesty's Military and Naval Forces, Res. 1872
Factory Acts (Extension to Shops), 521
High Commissioner of New Guinea, 66
Housing of the Working Classes, 1063, 1509;—Sites of the Metropolitan Prisons, 65, 846
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1795, 1811, 1819, 1820; Postponed *cl.* 6, 1836
India (Finance, &c.)—Financial Statement, 526
Ireland—Questions
  Depression of Trade—A Royal Commission, 67
  Education — Irish National Teachers — Assistant Teachers, 824
  Irish Industries—A Royal Commission, 678
  Irish Land Commission — New Commissioners, 843
  Land Purchase Bill, 1452
Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, 1652, 1657, 1658, 1659, 1662; *cl.* 4, 1669, 1671; *cl.* 17, 1680; Consid. *add. cl.* 1848
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Birmingham Assizes—Sheriffs' Expenses, 515
Parliament—Questions
  Adjournment, 475, 476
  Business of the House, 66, 242, 525, 526, 527, 681, 843, 847, 848, 849, 1062, 1063, 1065, 1284, 1285, 1454, 1455, 1582, 1583, 1584
  House of Commons—Officers of this House—Serjeant and Deputy Serjeant, 246
  Prorogation, Ministerial Statement, 1742, 1744
[*cont.*

Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks—*cont.*
Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24, Res. 268, 272
Prince Henry of Battenberg's Naturalization, Comm. 682, 683
Returns of Ground Rent—Holders and Owners of Mining Royalties, 1062
Secretary for Scotland, 248; Comm. *cl.* 6, 1168, 1169
Supply—Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 326
Report, Res. 1, 530
South Africa and St. Helena, 467, 468
Supply (Supplementary Estimate) — Gordon Monument, 468
Telegraph Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 577
Universities (Scotland), 2R. 681
Ways and Means—Inland Revenue—Grocers' Licences (Ireland), 836

Beauchamp, Earl (Paymaster General)
Criminal Law Amendment, Commons Amendts. Consid. 1549, 1556
Law and Police—The International Club, 237
Smoke Nuisance Abatement (Metropolis), 2R. 480

Bentinck, Right Hon. G. A. F. Cavendish, *Whitehaven*
Army Estimates—Miscellaneous Effective Services, 156, 164, 167
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. 588; *cl.* 2, 597, 602, 604; Amendt. 610, 612, 623; *cl.* 3, 701; Amendt. 708; *add. cl.* 912, 919; Consid. *add. cl.* 1396; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1463; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1466; *cl.* 9, 1499
Law and Police—Eliza Armstrong, a Child under 14 Years, 1739
Metropolitan Police, 62
Supply, Report, Res. 3, 546; Res. 4, 552

Beresford, Mr. G. De La Poer, *Armagh*
Admiralty, The—A Permanent Finance Lord, 243
Army Medical Service, 821
Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary—Promotion of Head Constables, 1048
Navy — Evolutionary Squadron — H.M.S. "Ajax," 243
Supply, Report, Res. 530

Biggar, Mr. J. G., *Cavan Co.*
Army—Royal Irish Fusiliers, 819
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—The 4th Royal Irish Fusiliers (Cavan Militia)—Major Lionel Brooke, 1449
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1234, 1245
County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (Pensions), Comm. 1516
India—Madras Presidency—Revolt of Talooks, 51
Ireland—Questions
Arrears of Rent Act, 1882—Case of Mr. Templeman, Agent to Mr. S. C. Armstrong, 825
Education Office—The Inspection Staff, 1724
Fisheries—The Foyle and the Bann, 1271

[*cont.*

Biggar, Mr. J. G.—*cont.*
Law and Justice—Bailiff to the Sheriff of Meath Co. 1567
Law and Police—Cork Co. Police, 667
Local Government Board—Clerk to the Bangor Town Commissioners, 1039
Lunatic Asylums—Appointments, 45
Lunatics—Armagh Lunatic Asylum, 1270
Post Office—Sunday Mail to Achill Island, 831;—Rural Letter Carrier, Co. Cavan, 1266
Registration of Voters—Revision Courts, Co. Cavan, 1270
Royal Irish Constabulary — Pursuit of Poachers, 1721
Tramways Order in Council, 519
Ireland—Poor Law—Questions
Belfast Union Workhouse — Charge of Drunkenness against the Schoolmasters, 1450, 1724
Lurgan Union — Dr. John Scott, 1037, 1720
Mr. Graham, Clerk to the Board of Guardians, Cootehill Union, 47
Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1118
Post Office Clerks, 819
Post Office (Scotland) — Telegraph Office Clerks, 1276
Supply—Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, 452, 453
Tramways and Public Companies (Ireland) Act, 1883, 509

Board of Trade—President (*see* Richmond and Gordon, Duke of)

Board of Trade—Secretary to (*see* **De Worms**, Baron H.)

Boord, Mr. T. W., *Greenwich*
Army—Ordnance Department—Widow of Mr. Frederick Rance, 675;—Woolwich Arsenal, 1279
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1243

Borlase, Mr. W. C., *Cornwall, E.*
Public Health (Metropolis)—River Thames—Purification of Sewage, 1282, 1573

Bourke, Right Hon. R. (Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs), *Lynn Regis*
Africa (East Coast)—German Annexation at Zanzibar, 1455, 1576
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1223
Egypt—Questions
Alexandria Indemnity Awards, 1269
Assembly of Notables, 668, 669
Colonel de Coetlogon, 674
Internal Administration — Use of the Kourbash and Forced Labour, 840
International Guarantee, 670, 671;—Correspondence, 846
Soudan—Garrison of Kassala, 64, 65, 667;—Late Expedition under Hicks Pasha—Case of the Late E. B. Evans, Interpreter, 1040
Morocco—Suppression of Journals, 669, 670

[*cont.*

Bourke, Right Hon. R.—*cont.*
Papal See—Diplomatic Communication with the Vatican—Sir George Errington, 686
Peru and Chili—Peruvian Bondholders, 1056, 1057, 1447, 1448, 1449
Slave Trade—Anglo-Egyptian Convention of 1877, 1570
Suez Canal—The Paris Conference, 1461
Treaty of Berlin—Article X.—The Varna-Rustchuck Railway, 1449;—Article LXI.—Reforms in Armenia, 836
Turkey (European Provinces)—Affairs of Macedonia, 62

Bramwell, Lord
Copyhold Enfranchisement, 2R. 486
Criminal Law Amendment, Commons Amendts. Consid. 1555
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 36; 2R. 232; Comm. 500
Recent Legislation—Socialistic Tendency, 655
River Thames (No. 2), Report, *cl.* 6, 814, 815; 3R. 1261
Waterworks Clauses Act (1847) Amendment, 3R. 25, 26, 27

Brand, Hon. H. R., *Stroud*
Army Estimates—Provisions, Forage, &c. 95, 97, 105
Warlike Stores, 134

Bright, Right Hon. J., *Birmingham*
Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24th, Res. 252, 259, 261, 266

Bright, Mr. J., *Manchester*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 740

Broadhurst, Mr. H., *Stoke-on-Trent*
Administration of Oaths (Canada), 1727
Church of England—Vicar of St. Mark's, South Shields, 672
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *add. cl.* 1406, 1422; *cl.* 4, 1473; Amendt. 1474
Depression of Trade and Industry, Royal Commission on—Names of the Commissioners, 824, 1285, 1726, 1727, 1745, 1914
Education Department—South Shields National School, 1728
Housing of the Working Classes (England), 846, 1064; 2R. 1607; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1787, 1807; *cl.* 14, 1830, 1831, 1832; Consid. *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1889
Parliamentary Voters—Registration of Voters in Agricultural Districts, 1568
Poor Law (England and Wales)—Hungerford Board of Guardians—Appointment of Master and Matron for the Workhouse, 1061
Prince Henry of Battenberg's Naturalization, Comm. 682
Returns of Ground Rent—Holders and Owners of Mining Royalties, 1061
Stationery Office—Government Printing, 676

Brodrick, Hon. W. St. J. F., *Surrey, W.*
Cattle Importation—Canadian and American Cattle, 1736
Electoral Acts—Distribution, 1742

Brodrick, Hon. W. St. J. F.—*cont.*
Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1063
Parliament—Business of the House—Land Purchase (Ireland), 1284, 1454
Prorogation, 1744
Public Health—Cholera, 1283
Supply—Prisons, Ireland, 360, 376

Brooks, Mr. M., *Dublin*
Ireland—Piers and Harbours—Kingstown Pier, 816

Brownlow, Earl (Secretary to the Local Government Board)
Lunacy Acts Amendment, 2R. 659

Bruce, Hon. R. P., *Fifeshire*
Egypt (Military Expedition)—Troops at Suakin, 834
Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 7, 1189
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. *cl.* 5, 1143, 1156; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1158, 1166; Schedule, Amendt. 1171
Supply (Supplementary Estimate)—Peterhead Harbour, 188

Bruce, Sir H. H., *Coleraine*
Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1111

Bryce, Mr. J., *Tower Hamlets*
Corporate Bodies (Metropolis)—The City Fellowship of Porters, 506
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* 875; Consid. *add. cl.* 1406, 1407
Federal Council of Australasia, Comm. 1120; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1122, 1123; *cl.* 18, Amendt. *ib.*
Housing of the Working Classes (England), 2R. 1621; Comm. 1750, 1752; *cl.* 3, 1778; Amendt. 1796, 1797, 1799, 1800, 1801, 1816
Infants, 2R. 1025
Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. 1635
Parliament—Business of the House—Prorogation, 1743, 1745
Police Enfranchisement Extension, 674
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. *cl.* 5, 1158
Treaty of Berlin—Article LXI.—Reforms in Armenia, 835
Turkey (European Provinces)—Affairs of Macedonia, 62
Western Pacific—New Guinea—Form of Government for the English Portion, 1046

Buchanan, Mr. T. R., *Edinburgh*
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 9, 1499
Edinburgh Extension and Sewerage, Consid. 43
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. 1756, 1758; *cl.* 3, 1814
India—Railways—Candahar and Quetta Railway, 523
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Annual Financial Statement, Comm. 1375, 1378, 1379
Parliament—Business of the House, 1583

[*cont.*

Buchanan, Mr. T. R.—*cont.*
Secretary for Scotland, 522; Comm. 966; *cl.* 2, 980; *cl.* 3, 1127; *cl.* 5, 1144, 1145, 1146; Amendt. 1149, 1150, 1153, 1158; *add. cl.* 1170; Schedule, 1172

Bulwer, Mr. J. R., *Cambridgeshire*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* 872, 894

Burghley, Lord, *Northamptonshire, N.*
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—The Northampton Volunteers, 1278
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 13, 1829

Burgh Police and Health (Scotland) Bill
[H.L.] (*The Earl of Dalhousie*)
l. Committee * *Aug* 3 (No. 190)
Report * *Aug* 4
Bill withdrawn * *Aug* 10

Bury, Viscount (Under Secretary of State for War)
Army—Glencorse Military Prison, 212
Defences of the Empire — Armaments and Munitions of War, 21, 24
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 35
River Thames (No. 2), Comm. 235

Buxton, Mr. F. W., *Andover*
Army—2nd East Surrey Regiment, 1275

Buxton, Mr. S. C., *Peterborough*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 618

Callan, Mr. P., *Louth*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1234, 1241, 1250
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *add. cl.* 1423, 1425, 1426, 1427
Egypt (The Soudan)—Late Expedition under Hicks Pasha—Case of the late E. B. Evans, Interpreter, 1040
Ireland—Post Office—Tampering with Letters, 1041
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 4, 992; *cl.* 14, 1006; *cl.* 16, 1009; *add. cl.* 1024
Law and Justice—Jeffries' Case—Mr. Edlin, Assistant Judge, 673, 843, 844, 845, 1870
Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24th, Res. 250, 253, 254, 274, 303, 304

Cambridge, Duke of (Field Marshal Commanding-in-Chief)
Egypt—Soudan Expedition—Vote of Thanks to Her Majesty's Military and Naval Forces, Res. 1864

Cameron, Dr. C., *Glasgow*
Army Estimates—Provisions, Forage, &c. 83, 97, 109
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. 975; *cl.* 5, 1137; *cl.* 6, 1169

Campbell, Lord Colin, *Argyll*
Post Office—Mails to the Western Islands, 837, 1269

Campbell, Sir G., *Kirkcaldy, &c.*
Army Estimates — Provisions, Forage, &c. Amendt. 67, 76, 78, 80, 82, 83
Asia (Central)—Russia and Afghanistan—The "Penjdeh Incident," 1267, 1564
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1204
Earldom of Mar Restitution, 1R. 683, 684; Comm. 685
Egypt—Assembly of Notables, 667, 668, 669
Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff, 65
Federal Council of Australasia, Comm. 1119
High Commissioner of New Guinea, 66
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Consid. *cl.* 3, 1888
India—Railways—Indian Midland Railway, 507
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Annual Financial Statement, Comm. 1313, 1330, 1338
Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. 1633; *cl.* 2, 1653
Parliament—Business of the House, 527
Secretary for Scotland, 248; Comm. *cl.* 2, 980; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1125; *cl.* 5, 1152; Amendt. 1153, 1156
Supply, Report, Res. 2, 531

Campbell, Mr. J. A., *Glasgow and Aberdeen Universities*
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. 937; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1166, 1167

Campbell-Bannerman, Right Hon. H., *Stirling, &c.*
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. *cl.* 6, 1166

Camperdown, Earl of
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, Comm. 500

Canada, Dominion of
Administration of Oaths, Questions, Mr. Broadhurst, Mr. Healy; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Colonel Stanley) *Aug* 11, 1727
The Military Operations, Question, Mr. Albert Grey; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 4, 1060

Carrington, Lord
Egypt—Soudan Expedition—Vote of Thanks to Her Majesty's Military and Naval Forces, Res. 1863

Causton, Mr. R. K., *Colchester*
Army—Quartermasters and Riding Masters, 1277
Endowed Schools—Charity Commissioners—Sir Andrew Judd's School, Tonbridge, 1279, 1281
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1815

Cecil, Lord E. H. B. G., *Essex, W.*
Army Estimates—Clothing Establishments, &c. 114

Central Asia
Lords
Russia and Afghanistan—Delimitation of the Frontier, Question, Observations, The Duke of Marlborough; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury *Aug* 4, 1028

Central Asia
Commons
Russia and Afghanistan — The "Penjdeh Incident," Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 6, 1267;—*Arbitration*, Notice of Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 10, 1564

Ceylon—Lighthouses—The Basses Lights, Minicoy Lighthouse
Question, Mr. Sutherland; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 10, 1565

Chamberlain, Right Hon. J., *Birmingham*
Endowed Schools — Alderman Dauntsey's Charity (West Lavington), 1575
Parliament—Business of the House—Prorogation, Ministerial Statement, 1742, 1743
Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24th, Res. 285, 286, 287, 288

Chambers, Sir T. (The Recorder), *Marylebone*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 746

Chancellor of the Exchequer (*see* Beach, Right Hon. Sir M. E. Hicks-)

Chancellor, The Lord (*see* Halsbury, Lord)

Chaplin, Right Hon. H. (Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster and Vice President of the Committee of Council on Agriculture), *Lincolnshire, Mid*
Cattle Importation — Canadian and American Cattle, 1735, 1737
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Order in Council—Swine, 248, 524;—Pleuro-Pneumonia in Ireland, 1059, 1060

Charity Commissioners' Schemes — Labourers' Allotments
Question, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 11, 1740

Cheetham, Mr. J. F., *Derbyshire, N.*
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1792; Amendt. 1799, 1802

Cholera Hospitals (Ireland) Bill
(*Marquess of Waterford*)
l. Read 3ª* *July* 28 (No. 182)
Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 39]

Churchill, Right Hon. Lord R. H. S. (Secretary of State for India), *Woodstock*
India—Indian Civil Service—Age of Candidates, 513
  Madras Presidency—Revolt of Talooks, 51
  Railways—Indian Midland Railway, 507;—Candahar and Quetta Railway, 523
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Annual Financial Statement, 526, 676; Comm. 1286, 1313, 1318, 1321, 1337, 1346, 1347, 1353, 1377, 1378, 1382
Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24th, Res. 281, 283, 285, 286

Church of England—Excommunication at Saham Toney
Question, Mr. Picton; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 6, 1276

Civil Service—Lower Division Clerks and Writers
Questions, Mr. Puleston, Mr. Tomlinson; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 11, 1733

Clarke, Mr. E. G., *Plymouth*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 600; *cl.* 3, 626, 690, 698, 704; *cl.* 4, 741, 755, 757, 760, 763; *cl.* 6, 788; *cl.* 12, 807; *add. cl.* 885; Consid. *cl.* 4, 1472, 1473

Colebrooke, Sir T. E., *Lanarkshire, N.*
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. 945

Collings, Mr. J., *Ipswich*
Allotments Extension Act, 1882—Folkestone Charity Land, 1737, 1738
  Lady Isabella Dodd's Charity, Ellesborough, Bucks, 1044
Charity Commissioners' Schemes—Labourers' Allotments, 1740
Corrupt Practices Act—The Suffolk Conservative Association, 1046
Endowed Schools—Alderman Dauntsey's Charity (West Lavington), 1574, 1575
  Charity Commissioners—Tonbridge School, 1042, 1281
Housing of the Working Classes (England), 2R. 1609, 1612; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1760, 1761, 1762, 1765, 1767; *cl.* 3, 1771, 1777, 1779, 1801, 1802; Motion for reporting Progress, 1803; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1827, 1828; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1829, 1831, 1833, 1835
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal—Supplementary Lists, 1284

[*cont.*

Collings, Mr. J.—*cont.*
  Parliamentary Elections—Use of National Elementary School Rooms, 1044
  Parliamentary Voters—Registration of Voters in Agricultural Districts, 1568, 1569
  Prince Henry of Battenberg's Naturalization, Comm. 683
  Recreation Grounds — Woodcote Green, Bromsgrove, 1739, 1740
  Registration (Supplementary) Lists, 1581

Colonies—Secretary of State for (*see* Stanley, Right Hon. F. A.)

Colonies—Under Secretary of State for (*see* Dunraven, Earl of)

Colthurst, Col. D. La Zouche, *Cork Co.*
  Educational Endowments (Ireland), Comm. Preamble, 1913
  Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 12, 1002; *cl.* 18, 1012; *add. cl.* 1020; Lords Amendts. Consid. 1891, 1893
  Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, 1661
  Parliament—Business of the House, 1584
  Supply—Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, 419, 440
    Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 310
  Tramways Order in Council (Ireland), 519

Committee of Council on Education—Vice President (*see* Stanhope, Right Hon. E.)

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill
(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Holland*)
c. Resolution in Committee *July* 29
  Resolution reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered; read 1º * *July* 30
  Read 2º * *July* 31
  Committee; Report *Aug* 3, 980
  Read 3º, after debate *Aug* 5, 1200
l. Read 1ª * (*E. of Iddesleigh*) *Aug* 6
  Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *Aug* 7
  Read 3ª * *Aug* 10

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts
  Cattle Importation—Canadian and American Cattle, Questions, Mr. Duckham, Mr. Albert Grey, Mr. Brodrick, Mr. Staveley Hill, Colonel Nolan; Answers, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Chaplin) *Aug* 11, 1731
  Pleuro-Pneumonia in Ireland, Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 3, 818; Questions, Mr. Albert Grey, Colonel Nolan, Mr. Duckham; Answers, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Chaplin) *Aug* 4, 1058
  Swine—Cleansing and Disinfection of Premises—The Orders in Council, Question, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Chaplin) *July* 30, 523

[*cont.*

Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—cont.
  Swine Fever—Order in Council for Compulsory Slaughter, Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, The Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (Mr. Chaplin) *July* 28, 248

Copyhold Enfranchisement Bill
(*The Lord Hobhouse*)
l. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 30, 482
  Amendt. to leave out ("now,") add ("this day three months") (*The Earl Stanhope*); after short debate, on Question, That ("now") &c.? Cont. 14, Not-Cont. 46; M. 32; resolved in the negative; Bill to be read 2ª on this day three months (No. 185)

Corrupt Practices Act — The Suffolk Conservative Association
  Question, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) *Aug* 4, 1046

Corry, Mr. J. P., *Belfast*
  Supply, Report, Res. 1, 530

County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (Pensions) Bill (*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Committee deferred *July* 28, 382
  Committee; Report; read 3º *Aug* 7, 1511
l. Read 1ª * (*M. of Waterford*) *Aug* 10 (No. 244)
  Read 2ª *; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Aug* 11

Courtney, Mr. L. H., *Liskeard*
  Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 599, 614; *cl.* 3, 714; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 755, 782; *cl.* 6, 785, 786; Amendt. 788, 789, 792; *cl.* 12, Motion for reporting Progress, 804
  Housing of the Working Classes—Sites of the Metropolitan Prisons, 65, 846
  Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 4, 990; *cl.* 8, 994; *cl.* 14, 1005; *add. cl.* 1018
  Supply, Report, Res. 2, 537, 544
    South Africa and St. Helena, 468

Courtown, Earl of
  Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. 1264; Comm. *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1441, 1442

Cranbrook, Viscount (Lord President of the Council)
  Copyhold Enfranchisement, 2R. 492
  Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 30, 31, 34; 2R. 231

Criminal Law Amendment Bill [H.L.]
(*Mr. H. H. Fowler*)
c. Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 30, 573
  Amendt. to leave out from "That," add "in view of the fact that there already exists much legislation of the kind, little known or

[*cont.*

Criminal Law Amendment Bill—cont.
resorted to, and that besides much of it is of a contradictory character partly for the regulation and partly for the repression of vice, it is expedient that further inquiry and more deliberation be given to the subject before proceeding with the said Committee" (*Mr. Hopwood*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after short debate, Amendt. withdrawn; main Question put, and agreed to; Committee—R.P. [Bill 159]
Committee—R.P. *July* 31, 686
Committee; Report *Aug* 3, 850
Considered *Aug* 6, 1336; after long debate, Further Proceeding on Consideration deferred
Further Proceeding on Consideration resumed *Aug* 7, 1461; after long debate, Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°;" Motion agreed to; Bill read 3°, and passed, with Amendments [Bill 257]
l. Returned from the Commons agreed to, with Amendments; the said Amendments to be printed; and to be considered on Monday next *Aug* 7 (No. 242)
Commons' Amendments considered, and agreed to *Aug* 10, 1549

CROPPER, Mr. J., *Kendal*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 749
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Annual Financial Statement, Comm. 1362
Supply—South Africa and St. Helena, 462

CROSS, Right Hon. Sir R. A. (Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Lancashire, S.W.*
Church of England — Excommunication at Saham Toney, 1276
Corporate Bodies (Metropolis)—City Fellowship of Porters, 507
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, 578; *cl.* 2, 592, 599, 616; Amendt. 618, 622; *cl.* 3, 627, 629, 692, 696, 697, 698, 703, 705, 708, 709, 710, 715; *cl.* 4, 719, 736, 755; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 768, 770, 778, 780, 782, 783, 784; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 790, 792; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 793; *cl.* 12, 796, 804, 805; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 808; *cl.* 15, 809; *add. cl. ib.* 850, 854, 859, 860, 861, 862, 872, 873, 874, 875, 880, 890, 891, 894, 896, 902, 903, 904, 907, 912, 914; Schedule, 920; Consid. *add. cl.* 1386, 1387, 1388, 1393, 1401, 1416, 1417, 1421, 1428; *cl.* 1, 1461; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1462, 1463, 1465; *cl.* 3, Amendt. *ib.*, 1469; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1470, 1471, 1473, 1477, 1479; *cl.* 5, Amendt. *ib.*, 1480, 1481, 1482, 1483, 1484, 1486, 1488; *cl.* 9, 1493; Amendt. 1494, 1495, 1497, 1502, 1503; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1505; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1508
Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876—Vivisection Licences—Dr. E. E. Klein, 1446
Ecclesiastical Commissioners — Taxation of Legal Expenses, 511
Education of the Blind—The Royal Commission, 1581;—Constitution of the Commission, 1727
Electoral Acts—Distribution, 1742

[*cont.*

CROSS, Right Hon. Sir R. A.—*cont.*
Explosives Act—Appointment of Mr. James Martin, Inspector for Brawney and Athlone, 1058
Housing of the Working Classes (England), 522, 679, 846, 1064; 2R. 1585, 1621; Comm. 1757; *cl.* 1, 1763; Amendt. 1766, 1767, 1768, 1769; *cl.* 3, 1770, 1772, 1775, 1776, 1780, 1796, 1797, 1799, 1800, 1801, 1802, 1803, 1805; *cl.* 4, 1821; *cl.* 5, Amendt. *ib.* 1822, 1823; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1824; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1826, 1827, 1828, 1829; *cl.* 14, Amendt. *ib.*; Postponed *cl.* 6, 1835; *add. cl.* 1836, 1838; Schedule, Amendt. 1839; Consid. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1888; *cl.* 14, 1889
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Questions
  Circuit System, 674
  Mr. Edlin, Q.C. 519, 673
  Release of —— Briggs, a Convict, 840
Law and Police—Questions
  Eliza Armstrong, a Child under 14 Years, 1739
  "Pall Mall Gazette"—Publication of Offensive Articles, 52
  Political Clubs, 1569
  Use of Bicycles on Public Roads—Furious Driving, 249
Metropolis—Questions
  Local Government outside the City Area, 1732
  Metropolitan Police, 63
  Metropolitan Water Companies, 1738
  Public Health—Purification of the Thames (Canvey Island), 1576
  Street Traffic—Obstruction in the Streets, 1729
  Tramway Companies—Employés' Hours of Labour, 1046
Naval Courts Martial—Collision between the "Hecla" and the "Cheerful," 1733
Parliament—Business of the House, 242, 1063, 1285
Parliamentary Elections (Ireland) — County Down Election—Ballot Act, 513
Parliamentary Voters—Registration of Voters in Agricultural Districts, 1569
Police Enfranchisement Extension, Comm. 1524
Prince Henry of Battenberg's Naturalization, Comm. 682
Recreation Grounds — Woodcote Green, Bromsgrove, 1739, 1740
Registration (Supplementary) Lists, 1581
Representation of the People Act, 1884—Parliamentary Franchise (Scotland)—Crofters under £10 Rental, 505
Scotland—Law and Police—Illegal Impounding of Children, 506
  Public Health — Insanitary Condition of Duthil Churchyard, 47
Secretary for Scotland, 522; Comm. 977, 979; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 980; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1128; *cl.* 5, 1147, 1155, 1158; *cl.* 6, 1165, 1166, 1167; *add. cl.* 1171; Schedule, *ib.*, 1172, 1173
Supply—Prisons, Ireland, 376
Supply (Supplementary Estimates)—Peterhead Harbour, 189
Universities (Scotland), 2R. Bill withdrawn, 1250

CROSS, Mr. J. K., *Bolton*
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Annual Financial Statement, Comm. 1315, 1318, 1321

Crown Lands Bill
(*Mr. Hibbert, Mr. Herbert Gladstone*)
c. Report of Select Comm. *July* 29
Committee * (*on re-comm*); Report; read 3° *July* 30 [Bill 51]
l. Read 1ª * (*E. of Iddesleigh*) *July* 31 (No. 224)
Read 2ª * *Aug* 4
Report *; read 3ª *Aug* 7

Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876—*Vivisection Licences—Dr. E. E. Klein*
Question, Mr. Firth; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 7, 1446

Customs and Inland Revenue (No. 2) Bill
(*Sir Arthur Otway, Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir Henry Holland*)
c. Considered *July* 27, 192 [Bill 223]
Read 3° * *July* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*E. of Iddesleigh*) *July* 30 (No. 220)
Read 2ª * *July* 31
Committee *; Report *Aug* 3
Read 3ª * *Aug* 4
Royal Assent *Aug* 6 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 51]

Customs Department
Collectors of Customs, Question, The Earl of Limerick; Answer, The Earl of Iddesleigh (First Lord of the Treasury) *July* 31, 658
Commissioners of Customs—A Report, Question, Mr. R. H. Paget; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *Aug* 3, 828

Cyprus (Finance, &c.)—Landing Duties
Question, Viscount Newport; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Colonel Stanley) *July* 27, 63

DALRYMPLE, Mr. C. (Lord of the Treasury), *Buteshire*
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. 951, 952, 966

DAVENPORT, Mr. H. T., *Staffordshire, N.*
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *add. cl.* 1404; Amendt. 1406

DAVEY, Mr. H., *Christchurch*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 596, 602, 615, 616, 618, 622; *cl.* 3, Motion for reporting Progress, 628, 713; *cl.* 4, 749; Consid. *cl.* 9, 1493
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1780, 1801, 1812; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1824, 1826, 1828
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 4, 991
Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. 1623
Worcester Extension, Lords Amendts. Consid. *cl.* 21 A, 666

DAWNAY, Hon. G. C. (Surveyor General of Ordnance), *York, N.R.*
Army—Limerick Army Clothing Factory, 1458
Ordnance Department—Widow of Mr. Frederick Rance, 675; — Woolwich Arsenal, 1279
Army Estimates—Clothing Establishments, &c. 113, 116
Provisions, Forage, &c. 93, 100
Warlike Stores, 131

DAWSON, Mr. C., *Carlow*
Education of the Blind, Royal Commission on—Constitution of the Commission, 1727
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. Postponed *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1835; *add. cl.* 1837, 1838
Land Purchase (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* 1847
Supply—Commissioners of National Education, Ireland, 416, 450
Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 331
Report, Res. 1, 529

DEASY, Mr. J., *Cork*
Ireland—Poor Law—Bantry Union, 245
Supply—Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 350

Deeds of Arrangement Registration Bill
(*Sir Joseph M'Kenna, Mr. W. Newzam Nicholson*)
c. Bill withdrawn * *July* 27 [Bill 225]

DE LA WARR, Earl
Malta—Examinations for the Public Service (Army, Navy, and Civil), 4

DENMAN, Lord
Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. *add. cl.* 1195, 1196; 3R. Amendt. 1266
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 2R. 232
Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry—Constitution of the Commission, 1545
Women's Suffrage, 2R. 216

Depression of Trade and Industry—Royal Commission on the

The following List of the Commissioners appeared in *The London Gazette*, September 1:—

The Earl of IDDESLEIGH (Chairman), The Earl of DUNRAVEN, Right Hon. G. SCLATER-BOOTH, Sir JAMES ALLPORT, Knt., JOHN AIRD, Esq., THOMAS BIRTWHISTLE, Esq., LIONEL LEWIS COHEN, Esq., JAMES PORTER CORRY, Esq., DAVID DALE, Esq., CHARLES JAMES DRUMMOND, Esq., WILLIAM FARRER ECROYD, Esq., HENRY HUCKS GIBBS, Esq., WILLIAM HENRY HOULDSWORTH, Esq., WILLIAM LAWIES JACKSON, Esq., GEORGE AULDJO JAMIESON, Esq., NEVILLE LUBBOCK, Esq., PHILIP ALBERT MUNTZ, Esq., ARTHUR O'CONNOR, Esq., ROBERT HARRY INGLIS PALGRAVE, Esq., CHARLES MARK PALMER, Esq., WILLIAM PEARCE, Esq., BONAMY PRICE, Esq., Professor of Political Economy, Oxford University, SAMUEL STOREY, Esq.

HERBERT GEORGE MURRAY, Esq.,
Secretary.

[*cont*·

Depression of Trade and Industry—Royal Commission on the—cont.
  Questions, Mr. Atkinson, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 27, 62; Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 30, 513; Observations, Mr. Arthur Arnold; short debate thereon *Aug* 5, 1236; Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 6, 1285
  Names of the Commissioners, Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Broadhurst; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 3, 823
  Ministerial Statement, Question, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 7, 1453
  Constitution of the Commission, Observations, The First Lord of the Treasury (The Earl of Iddesleigh); short debate thereon *Aug* 10, 1531
  Memorandum for the Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry; ordered to be laid before the House (*The Earl of Iddesleigh*); Memorandum laid before the House (pursuant to Order of this day), and to be printed (No. 247)
  Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Observations, Mr. Shaw Lefevre *Aug* 10, 1579; Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Mr. Broadhurst; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 11, 1726; Personal Explanation, The First Lord of the Treasury (The Earl of Iddesleigh) *Aug* 12, 1868; Observations, Mr. Broadhurst, 1914 [House counted out]

de Ros, Lord
  Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 35

De Worms, Baron H. (Secretary to the Board of Trade), *Greenwich*
  Ceylon—Lighthouses—The Basses Lights—Minicoy Lighthouse, 1565
  Egypt—Light Dues, 1566, 1567
  Mercantile Marine—Pilots—Test of Colour-Blindness, 1572
  Railways (England and Wales)—Terminal Charges, 1049
  Royal Commission on Loss of Life at Sea—The Evidence, 841, 1060
  Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. 209; Comm. 983; *cl.* 2, 1173; Amendt. 1174; *cl.* 4, 1175, 1178, 1179; Amendt. 1181, 1182; *cl.* 5, 1183; *cl.* 6, 1184, 1185; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1186, 1187, 1189, 1190; *cl.* 10, *ib.*; *add. cl.* 1191; Amendt. 1192; Consid. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1509, 1510; *cl.* 7, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 8, Amendt. *ib.*, 1511
  Secretary for Scotland, Comm. *cl.* 5, 1158
  Trade and Navigation Accounts—Importation of Cattle, &c. from Ireland, 1050

Dickson, Mr. T. A., *Tyrone*
  Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1097; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1651; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1666, 1672; *cl.* 5, 1675, 1676; *add. cl.* 1700
  Supply—Prisons, Ireland, 367

Digby, Mr. J. K. D. Wingfield, *Somerset, Mid*
  Moveable Dwellings, 2R. 1705

Dilke, Right Hon. Sir C. W., *Chelsea, &c.*
  Housing of the Working Classes (England), 1508; 2R. 1597; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1761, 1762, 1765; *cl.* 3, 1799, 1804, 1805, 1808; *cl.* 4, 1821; *cl.* 13, 1828; *cl.* 14, 1830; *add. cl.* 1838; Consid. *cl.* 3, 1889

Dillwyn, Mr. L. L., *Swansea*
  Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *add. cl.* 1401
  Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1819

Douglas, Mr. A. Akers- (Secretary to the Treasury), *Kent, E.*
  Land Purchase (Ireland) [Advances], Res. [6th August] reported, 1523

Duckham, Mr. T., *Herefordshire*
  Cattle Importation—Canadian and American Cattle, 1734
  Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Pleuro-Pneumonia in Ireland, 1059
  Trade and Navigation Accounts—Importation of Cattle, &c. from Ireland, 1050

Duff, Mr. R. W., *Banffshire*
  Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 6, 1184; *cl.* 7, 1189; Consid. 1511

Dunraven, Earl of (Under Secretary of State for the Colonies)
  Army—Army Reserve—End of Service with the Colours, 1545
    Field Artillery and Small Arms, 1527
  Malta—Examinations for the Public Service (Army, Navy, and Civil), 11

Dyke, Right Hon. Sir W. H. (Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland), *Kent, Mid*
  Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1239
  Educational Endowments (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* 1912
  Ireland—Questions
    Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Pleuro-Pneumonia, 818
    Fisheries—River Shannon—Limerick Board of Conservators, 50;—The Foyle and the Bann, 1271
    Fishery Laws—River Suir—Case of —— O'Shea and others, 53
    Irish Administration—Mr. E. G. Jenkinson, 1039
    Irish Land Commission—Appeal Court—Appeals from Tenants on Lord Rosse's Estate, Parsonstown, 1578;—Sub-Commissioners, 677
    Local Government Board—Clerk to the Bangor Town Commissioners, 1039
    Lunatic Asylums—Appointments, 45;—Armagh Lunatic Asylum, 1271
    Public Meetings—Meeting at Dromore, 1883—Death of —— Giffen, 1572

[*cont.*

DYKE, Right Hon. Sir W. H.—*cont.*
- Public Works — Deductions from Road Contractors' Accounts—Mr. F. Morris, Secretary to Grand Jury, Co. Clare, 1048
- Roads and Bridges—The Tour Slate Quarries—Bridge over the River Suir, 55
- Royal University—Examinations, 245
- Science and Art Department, 1572
- Seed Supply Act — Non-Payment of the Seed Rate, 679

Ireland—Law and Justice—Questions
- Bailiff to the Sheriff of Meath Co. 1567
- Court of Queen's Bench—Fines and Penalties Office—Mr. O'Brien, M.P. 822
- Earl of Belfast, Clerk of the Peace, Co. Antrim, 54
- Mr. F. Falkiner, Q.C., Recorder of Dublin, 839
- Petty Sessions Clerk—Mullaghroe Petty Sessions District, 1038

Ireland—Law and Police—Questions
- Affray in Co. Monaghan, 1741, 1871, 1872
- Cork Co. Police, 667
- Detention of Intoxicated Persons, 1725
- Extra Police, Limerick, 1277
- Fines for Dangerous Use of Fireworks at Ballinrobe, 1571
- Illegal Fishing in Kildare — Insanitary Houses at Kill, 1048
- Waterford Free Force, 826

Ireland—National Education—Questions
- Board of Intermediate Education—Examination of Girls, 520
- Board of National Education—Extra Instruction, 58
- Commissioners of National Education—Erection of New Schools—Building Materials, 1570 ;—National School Teachers —Case of Mr. Andrew Devitt, Porrelsborough, 1723
- Education Office—The Inspection Staff, 1723, 1724
- Industrial School at Ballaghadarreen, Co. Mayo, 1451
- Intermediate Education—Examinations, 58
- Model School, Kilkenny, 842
- Schoolmaster of Stranagomis National School, Co. Tyrone, 504

Ireland—Poor Law—Questions
- Bantry Union, 245
- Charge of Intoxication against the Schoolmasters of the Belfast Workhouse, 1451, 1725
- Galway and Arran Island Dispensaries, 520
- Lurgan Union—Dr. John Scott, 1037, 1721
- Mr. Graham, Clerk to the Board of Guardians, Cootehill Union, 47
- Mr. Wiggins, Master of the Clones Union Workhouse, 1724

Ireland—Registration of Voters—Questions
- Assistant Revising Barristers, 1457, 1730
- Co. Antrim, 838
- Lists of Voters—Derry, 842
- Printing of Voters' Lists, Co. Armagh, 59 ;—Supplemental Lists, 828
- Publication of Lists of Voters in North Antrim, 1055 ;—Co. Sligo, 1272
- Revision Courts — Co. Cavan, 1270 ;— Tyrone and Donegal, 1273
- Revision of Sessions—Kilmacthomas Union, 827

[*cont.*

DYKE, Right Hon. Sir W. H.—*cont.*

Ireland—Royal Irish Constabulary—Questions
- Appointment of Medical Officers, 57
- Extra Police and Hut at Lisdoonvarna, Co. Clare, 508
- Extra Police at Gweedore, Co. Donegal, 48
- Extra Police at Portadown, 505
- Pensioners, 51
- Promotion of Head Constables, 1049
- Protection Post at Bunduff, Co. Leitrim, 1038
- Pursuit of Poachers, 1721

Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 8, 993 ; *cl.* 12, 1000, 1003 ; *cl.* 14, 1004 ; *cl.* 15, 1006 ; *add. cl.* 1015, 1020 ; Lords Amendts. Consid. 1890, 1891

Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1065, 1070 ; Comm. *cl.* 1, 1637 ; *cl.* 3, 1664 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1666 ; *add. cl.* 1695 ; Schedule, 1704

Land Purchase (Ireland) [Advances], Res. (6th August) reported, 1523

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Lords Amendts. Consid. *cl.* B, 1564

Parliament—Business of the House, 58

Supply—Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, 422, 423, 441, 442, 445, 447, 451
- Prisons, Ireland, 373, 377

Tramways and Public Companies (Ireland) Act, 1883, 509

Earldom of Mar Restitution Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Privy Seal*)

l. Report * *July* 28 (No. 217)
Committee ; after short debate *July* 30, 494
Report * ; read 3ª *July* 31
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 1°" (*The Attorney General, Sir Richard Webster*) *July* 31, 683 ; after short debate, Motion agreed to ; Bill read 1°
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2° ;" after short debate, Motion agreed to ; Bill read 2°, and committed to a Select Committee ; Committee nominated ; List of the Committee, 685
Moved, "That the name of the hon. Member for Kirkcaldy (Sir George Campbell) be added" (*The Attorney General*) ; Motion agreed to ; name added
Ordered, That Three be the quorum
Ordered, That the Committee have leave to sit and proceed upon Monday next
Bill to be printed [Bill 256]
Report of Select Comm. *Aug* 3
Read 3° * *Aug* 4
l. Royal Assent *Aug* 6 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 48]

East India Army Pensions Deficiency Bill (*Sir Henry Holland, Colonel Walrond*)

c. Ordered ; read 1° * *July* 29 [Bill 255]
Read 2°, after short debate *July* 31, 811
Committee * ; Report *Aug* 3
Considered * *Aug* 4
Read 3° * *Aug* 5
l. Read 1ª * (*E. of Iddesleigh*) *Aug* 6 (No. 239)
Read 2ª * ; Committee negatived *Aug* 7
Read 3ª * *Aug* 10

East India Army Pensions Deficiency [Creation of Annuity]
Res. considered in Committee, and agreed to *July* 31, 811
Res. reported *Aug* 3

Ecclesiastical Commissioners (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]
c. Read 1° * *July* 29 [Bill 253]
Read 2° * *July* 31
Committee *; Report; read 3° *Aug* 3
l. Royal Assent *Aug* 6 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 55]

Ecclesiastical Commissioners, The—Taxation of Legal Expenses
Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross); Question, Mr. Arthur Arnold [no reply] *July* 30, 510

Edinburgh Extension and Sewerage Bill [Lords] (by Order)
c. Considered *July* 27, 37; after short debate, Moved, "That the Bill be re-committed, in respect of Clause 36, to the former Committee" (*Sir Arthur Otway*); Question put, and agreed to; Leave to the Committee to sit and proceed forthwith

Educational Endowments (Ireland) Bill [H.L.] (*Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Read 2°, after debate *Aug* 11, 1855 [Bill 176]
Committee; Report, after short debate *Aug* 12, 1894

Educational Endowments (Ireland) [Salaries and Expenses]
Res. considered in Committee, and agreed to *Aug* 12, 1913
Res. reported *Aug* 13

Education Department (England and Wales)
College of Aberystwith, Question, Mr. Morgan Lloyd; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 3, 842
Instruction of Deaf-Mute Children, Question, Mr. Woodall; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 4, 1053
London Board Schools—Annual Cost per Scholar, Question, Lord Algernon Percy; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 4, 1037
School Grants—Court of Bankruptcy—Newcastle-on-Tyne—The Vicar of St. Mark's, South Shields, Questions, Mr. Broadhurst; Answers, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) *July* 31, 672; *Aug* 11, 1728
The London School Board, Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 11, 1729;—*Expenditure*, Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 4, 1054

Education of the Blind
The Royal Commission, Question, Sir Gabriel Goldney; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 10, 1580
Constitution of the Commission, Questions, Mr. Dawson, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 11, 1727

EGYPT
LORDS
Finance—The International Guaranteed Loan of £9,000,000, Question, Observations, Earl Granville; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury *July* 28, 213
The Soudan—The Friendly Tribes, Question, The Earl of Wemyss; Answer, The Marquess of Salisbury *Aug* 4, 1031

Egypt — Soudan Expedition — Vote of Thanks to Her Majesty's Military and Naval Forces
Notice of Motion, The Marquess of Salisbury *Aug* 11, 1720
Moved to resolve, "1. That the Thanks of this House be given to General Lord Wolseley, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., for the distinguished skill and ability with which he planned and conducted the Expedition of 1884-85 by the Nile to the Soudan" [and other Resolutions] (*The Marquess of Salisbury*) *Aug* 12, 1859; after short debate, the said Resolutions severally agreed to, nemine dissentiente
Ordered, That The Lord Chancellor do communicate the said Resolutions to General Lord Wolseley, Admiral Lord John Hay, the Viceroy and Governor-General of India, and the Secretary of State for the Colonies, respectively, and that they be requested by The Lord Chancellor to communicate the same to the several Officers referred to therein

EGYPT
COMMONS
Finance
The International Guaranteed Loan of £9,000,000, Questions, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 30, 516; Questions, Mr. Villiers-Stuart, Mr. Arthur Arnold; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, 524; Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *July* 31, 670;—*The Correspondence*, Questions, Mr. Arthur Arnold, Mr. Villiers-Stuart; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *Aug* 3, 846

The Soudan
The Suakin-Berber Railway, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *July* 27, 54; Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith); Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor [no reply] *Aug* 3, 833

[*cont.*

Egypt—Commons—*The Soudan*—cont.

The Garrison of Kassala, Questions, Sir Walter B. Barttelot, Mr. Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *July* 27, 64; Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *July* 31, 667

The Expedition under Hicks Pasha—Case of the late E. B. Evans, Interpreter, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *Aug* 4, 1040

Reported Death of Osman Digna, Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 4, 1064

The Expeditions to Suakin, Question, Sir Henry Tyler; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 6, 1267

Military Expedition

The Troops at Suakin, Questions, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. R. Preston Bruce, Colonel King-Harman; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 3, 834;—*Supplies for*, Question, Colonel King-Harman; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 6, 1275

Battle of Abu Klea, Questions, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answers, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 3, 839; *Aug* 4, 1055

Lord Wolseley's Report, Question, Mr. M'Coan; Answer, The Secretary of State for War (Mr. W. H. Smith) *Aug* 4, 1064

(*Miscellaneous Questions*)

Colonel de Coetlogon, Question, Mr. Leamy; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *July* 31, 674

Internal Administration—Use of the Kourbash and Forced Labour, Question, Mr. Villiers-Stuart; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *Aug* 3, 840

Light Dues, Questions, Mr. Sutherland; Answers, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 10, 1566

Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 27, 65; Questions, Mr. M'Laren, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 28, 241

The Alexandria Indemnity Awards, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *Aug* 6, 1269

The Assembly of Notables, Questions, Sir George Campbell, Mr. M'Coan; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *July* 31, 667

Egypt (*Finance, &c.*) — *Policy of Her Majesty's Government*

Amendt. on 3R. of Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill *Aug* 5, To leave out from "That," add "this Bill should not be proceeded with until the Government has explained to the House the policy of the Government with regard to Egypt, and the conditions under which the recent guaranteed loan was issued" (*Mr. Labouchere*) *v.*, 1200; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put, and agreed to

Egypt — Soudan Expedition — Vote of Thanks to Her Majesty's Military and Naval Forces

Moved, "That the Thanks of this House be given to General Lord Wolseley, G.C.B., G.C.M.G., for the distinguished skill and ability with which he planned and conducted the Expedition of 1884-5 by the Nile to the Soudan" [and other Resolutions] (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *Aug* 12, 1872; after short debate, Resolutions agreed to, Nemine Contradicente

Elcho, Lord, *Haddingtonshire*

Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 7, 1189

Elementary Education Provisional Orders Confirmation (Birmingham, &c.) Bil

c. Report* *July* 28 [Bill 228]
Read 3°* *July* 29
l. Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. cxxix]

Elementary Education Provisional Order Confirmation (London) Bill

c. Report* *Aug* 3 [Bill 233]
Considered* *Aug* 4
Read 3°* *Aug* 5

Ellenborough, Lord

Defences of the Empire—Armaments and Munitions of War, 20
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 1R. 4

Elliot, Hon. A. R. D., *Roxburgh*

Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 10, 1501, 1502, 1503
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1785
Parliament—Business of the House, 1063, 1285
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. 978; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1128, 1143, 1148; *cl.* 6, 1169

Elphinstone, Lord

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Comm. Amendt. 1252; Commons Reasons Consid. 1708
Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment, Commons Amendts. Consid. 1716

Elton, Mr. C. I., *Somerset, W.*

Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1239
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 590, 597; Consid. *add. cl.* 1401; *cl.* 2, 1464; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1468
Moveable Dwellings, 2R. 1706

[*cont.*

Emly, Lord
Malta—Examinations for the Public Service (Army, Navy, and Civil), 13
Parliament—Palace of Westminster—House of Lords—Frescoes in the Peers' Robing Room, 17

Empire, Defences of the
Armaments and Munitions of War, Question, Observations, Lord Napier of Magdala; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for War (Viscount Bury); short debate thereon *July* 27, 17
Defence of the Seaports, Questions, Captain Price, Sir John Hay; Answers, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) *July* 27, 59

Endowed Schools
Alderman Dauntsey's Charity (*West Lavington*), Questions, Mr. Acland, Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Chamberlain; Answers, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope *Aug* 10, 1573
The Charity Commissioners — Sir Andrew Judd's School, Tonbridge, Question, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 4, 1042; Questions, Mr. Causton, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answers, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope *Aug* 6, 1279

Enfield, Viscount
Malta—Examinations for the Public Service (Army, Navy, and Civil), 9
Waterworks Clauses Act (1847) Amendment, 3R. 26

Errington, Sir G., *Longford Co.*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1233, 1234

Evidence by Commission Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Secretary Stanley*)
c. Committee; Report; read 3°, after short debate *July* 27, 207 [Bill 238]
l. Read 1ª* (*The Lord Chancellor, Lord Halsbury*) *July* 28 (No. 212)
Read 2ª* *July* 31
Committee* *Aug* 3
Report* *Aug* 4 (No. 228)
Read 3ª* *Aug* 6

Exchequer and Treasury Bills Bill
(*The Earl of Iddesleigh*)
l. Committee*; Report *July* 27
Read 3ª* *July* 28
Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 44]

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill
(*Mr. Herbert, Sir Henry Holland*)
c. Read 2°* *July* 28 [Bill 247]
Committee*; Report *July* 30
Read 3°* *July* 31

[*cont.*

Expiring Laws Continuance Bill—cont.
l. Read 1ª* (*E. of Iddesleigh*) *Aug* 3 (No. 229)
Read 2ª* *Aug* 4
Committee; Report; Observations, The Chairman of Committees (The Earl of Redesdale), Lord Denman *Aug* 5, 1195
Read 3ª *Aug* 6, 1266

Explosives Act—Appointment of Mr. James Martin, Inspector for Brawney and Athlone
Question, Mr. Justin Huntly M'Carthy; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 4, 1057

Factory Acts (Extension to Shops) Bill
(*Sir John Lubbock, Mr. Burt, Lord Randolph Churchill, Mr. Pell*)
c. Question, Sir John Lubbock; Answers, Mr. Hopwood, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 30, 521
Bill withdrawn* *Aug* 5 [Bill 23]

Farquharson, Dr. R., *Aberdeenshire, W.*
Army—Fatal Accident at Caterham Ranges, 55
Army Estimates—Retired Allowances, &c. to Officers of Militia, Yeomanry, and Volunteer Forces, 174
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 5, 774
Edinburgh Extension and Sewerage, Consid. 41

Federal Council of Australasia Bill [H.L.]
(*Secretary Colonel Stanley*)
c. Committee; Report, after short debate *Aug* 4, 1119 [Bill 165]
Considered*; read 3° *Aug* 5

Ferguson, Mr. R. C. Munro-, *Ross and Cromarty*
Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 7, 1189

Feversham, Earl of
Copyhold Enfranchisement, 2R. 493

Finch-Hatton, Hon. M. E. G., *Lincolnshire, S.*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 735

Findlater, Mr. W., *Monaghan*
Ireland—Law and Justice—Court of Bankruptcy, Dublin, 61; — Copying Clerks, 511
Registry of Deeds Act, 1883, 818
Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1112
Parliament—Business of the House, 57

Firth, Mr. J. F. B., *Chelsea*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 758, 765; *add. cl.* 882
Cruelty to Animals Act, 1876—Vivisection Licences—Dr. E. E. Klein, 1446

[*cont.*

FIRTH, Mr. J. F. B.—*cont.*
Housing of the Working Classes (England), 2R. 1619; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1790, 1799, 1800, 1801
Metropolis — Local Government Outside the City Area, 1732
Southwark and Vauxhall Water, 2R. 239, 241

FITZGERALD, Lord
Criminal Law Amendment, Commons Amendts. Consid. 1551
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. 1440
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Comm. 1259; Report, *add. cl.* 1429; Commons Reasons Consid., Amendt. 1709, 1714
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 31, 32; 2R. 234; Comm. 500
Parliament—Palace of Westminster—House of Lords — Frescoes in the Peers' Robing Room, 14
Waterworks Clauses Act (1847) Amendment, 3R. 26

FITZ-WYGRAM, Lieut.-General Sir F. W. J., *Hants, S.*
Army Estimates — Clothing Establishments, &c. 117
Military Education, 151
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Annual Financial Statement, Comm. 1364

FLOYER, Mr. C., *Dorsetshire*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, 695

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—Secretary of State (*see* SALISBURY, Marquess of)

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—Under Secretary of State (*see* BOURKE, Right Hon. R.)

FORSTER, Right Hon. W. E., *Bradford*
Army Estimates — Provisions, Forage, &c. 79, 81
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1222
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* 856
Customs and Inland Revenue (No. 2), Consid. *cl.* 20; Amendt. 192, 195
Federal Council of Australasia, Comm. Preamble, 1124
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. 957

FORTESCUE, Earl
Criminal Law Amendment, Commons Amendts. Consid. 1551
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Report, 1546, 1548; *cl.* 16, *ib*
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 2R. 224
Recent Legislation—Socialistic Tendency, 655

FOWLER, Right Hon. Sir R. N. (Lord Mayor), *London*
Africa (South)—Basutoland, 56, 57
Army Estimates — Miscellaneous Effective Services, 166
Provisions, Forage, &c. 75, 77, 79, 82

FOWLER, Right Hon. Sir R. N.—*cont.*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 5, 774; *cl.* 12, 807; Consid. *add. cl.* 1415, 1416
Customs and Inland Revenue (No. 2), Consid. *cl.* 25, 195
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 13, 1828
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Annual Financial Statement, 526; Comm. 1366
Parliament—House of Commons—Officers of this House — The Serjeant and Deputy Serjeant, 245
Post Office—Insurance of Parcels, 821
Slave Trade —Anglo-Egyptian Convention of 1877, 1570
Supply—Prisons, Ireland, 377
Report, Res. 2, 537

FOWLER, Mr. H. H., *Wolverhampton*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, 629, 687; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 722, 747
Parliament—Adjournment, 475

General Gordon—Design for a Statue
Questions, Mr. Mitchell Henry; Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Aug* 3, 837

Giants' Causeway, Portrush, and Bush Valley Railway and Tramways Bill
l. Read 3ª *July* 28, 213
Moved, "That so much of Standing Order No. 116 as requires the insertion in the Bill of provisions forfeiting in certain contingencies to the Crown money deposited under the Standing Orders, be dispensed with" (*The Lord Ventry*); Motion agreed to; Bill passed, and sent to the Commons

GILES, Mr. A., *Southampton*
Army (Military Expedition to the Soudan)—Widows of Soldiers, 1733
Naval Courts Martial—Collision between the "Hecla" and the "Cheerful," 1733
Post Office (Contracts)—The American Mail Service, 1045

GOLDNEY, Sir G., *Chippenham*
Education of the Blind—The Royal Commission, 1580
Housing of the Working Classes (England), 2R. 1612, 1613; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1791
Worcester Extension, Lords Amendts. Consid. *cl.* 21 A, 662, 663

GORDON, General Hon. Sir A. H., *Aberdeenshire, E.*
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 5, 1480; Amendt. 1481
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Annual Financial Statement, Comm. 1360
Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. 208, 210; Comm. *cl.* 4, 1176; Amendt. 1177, 1178; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 1183, 1184; 1185; *cl.* 7, 1186, 1189
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. *cl.* 6, 1163

Gorst, Sir J. E. (Solicitor General), *Chatham*
- Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 9, 1490, 1494, 1497, 1500; *cl.* 10, 1507
- Lotteries Act—Foreign Lotteries, 1453
- Supply—Temporary Commissions and Committees, 179

Gourley, Mr. E. T., *Sunderland*
- Army—Gunnery Experiments with Dynamite, 672
- Army Estimates—Provisions, Forage, &c. 105
- Egypt—Alexandria Indemnity Awards, 1269
- Navy—Dockyard Expenditure, 671
  - Evolutionary Squadron, 1270

Grafton, Mr. F. W., *Lancashire, N.E.*
- Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* 902, 903

Grant, Mr. D., *Marylebone*
- Metropolis—Parks—Regent's Park — Re-enclosure of Land, 1049, 1458
  - Public Health—State of the River Lea, 1456

Granville, Earl
- Copyhold Enfranchisement, 2R. 492
- Criminal Law Amendment, Commons Amendts. Consid. 1552
- Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Loan of £9,000,000, 213
- Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 1R. 2, 3, 4, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 214, 215; 2R. 222, 229, 234; Comm. 500
- Recent Legislation—Socialistic Tendency, 654
- Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry—Constitution of the Commission, 1537, 1541, 1543, 1544

Gray, Mr. E. D., *Carlow Co.*
- Army—Wire Gun Construction, 48, 49
- Bank Charter Act, 1845—Irish Banks—Note Issue, 508
- Constitution of the Admiralty—A Finance Lord, 1052
- Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 12, 794, 797, 802, 807, 808, 883, 894
- Housing of the Working Classes (England), 522, 1063; 2R. 1621
- Inland Revenue—Stamps—Stamp Distributors in Dublin, 510
- Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 8, 993, 994; *cl.* 15, 1007; *cl.* 16, 1008, 1009; *cl.* 18, 1011; *add. cl.* 1020
- Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, 1654, 1658, 1661; *cl.* 3, 1664; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1673, 1674, 1675; *add. cl.* 1703
- Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Mr. Edlin, Q.C. 518, 519
- Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Lords Amendts. Consid. *cl.* A, 1558
- Parliament—Business of the House, 848
- Parliamentary Elections (Ireland)—Co. Down Election—Ballot Act, 513
- Supply—Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 342
- Telegraph Acts Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 574

Greenwich Hospital Bill
(*The Lord Elphinstone*)
- *l.* Committee*; Report *July* 27 (No. 201)
- Read 3ª* *July* 28
- Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 42]

Gregory, Mr. G. B., *Sussex, E.*
- Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 593; *cl.* 3, 697, 705; *cl.* 4, 758; *add. cl.* 860, 864, 875, 917; Consid. *add. cl.* 1395, 1399; *cl.* 4, 1473; *cl.* 5, 1481; *cl.* 9, 1497
- Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. 1759; *cl.* 3, 1788
- Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1112
- Worcester Extension, Lords Amendts. Consid. *cl.* 21 A, 666

Grey, Mr. A. H. G., *Northumberland, S.*
- Cattle Importation—Canadian and American Cattle, 1734
- Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Pleuro-Pneumonia in Ireland, 1058
- Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 759; *cl.* 5, 780; Amendt. 782, 783
- Dominion of Canada—Military Operations, 1060
- Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. 1758; *cl.* 3, 1770, 1801, 1805

Ground Rent, Returns of—Holders and Owners of Mining Royalties
- Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 4, 1061

Halsbury, Lord (Lord Chancellor)
- Copyhold Enfranchisement, 2R. 490
- Expiring Laws Continuance, 3R. 1266
- Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Comm. 1255, 1258
- Prosecution of Offences Act, 1879, 656
- River Thames (No. 2), 3R. 1263

Hamilton, Right Hon. Lord G. F. (First Lord of the Admiralty), *Middlesex*
- Ireland—Coastguard — Divisional Officer at Dundalk, 526
- Navy—Questions
  - Accountant General of the Navy, 1053
  - Admiralty—A Permanent Finance Lord, 244, 1051, 1052;—Finance and Expenditure—Vote of Credit—Report of the Committee of Investigation, 1729
  - Dockyard Expenditure, 516, 671
  - Evolutionary Squadron, 1270, 1732;—H.M.S. "Ajax," 243
  - Navy List—Warrant Officers, 509

Hamilton, Mr. I. T., *Dublin Co.*
- Supply—Post Office Services, &c. 180

Harcourt, Right Hon. Sir W. G. V., *Derby*
- Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. 585; *cl.* 2, 596, 600, 601, 605, 606, 609, 613, 616, 617, 622; *cl.* 3, 626, 689, 695, 698, 706, 713, 714; *cl.* 4, 718, 758; *cl.* 5, 768, 773, 780,

[*cont.*

HARCOURT, Right Hon. Sir W. G. V.—*cont.*
783; *cl.* 6, 785, 787; Amendt. 788, 789; *cl.* 12, 801, 802, 808; *add. cl.* 859, 882, 891, 899, 908; Consid. *add. cl.* 1388, 1394, 1400, 1405, 1406, 1415, 1422; *cl.* 3, 1468, 1469; *cl.* 4, 1473, 1475; *cl.* 5, 1481
Law and Justice—Jeffries' Case—Mr. Edlin, Assistant Judge, 673, 844
Parliament—Business of the House, 843
Prince Henry of Battenberg's Naturalization, Comm. 682
Public Works Loans, Comm. *add. cl.* 982
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. 973

HARRINGTON, Mr. T., *Westmeath*
Army—Army Reserve, 1730
Ireland—Post Office—Sorters in Irish Mail Trains, 832

HARTINGTON, Right Hon. Marquess of, *Lancashire, N.E.*
Army Estimates—Military Education, 152
Miscellaneous Effective Services, 167
War Office, 170
Widows' Pensions, &c. 173
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1218
Egypt—Soudan Expedition—Vote of Thanks to Her Majesty's Military and Naval Forces, Res. 1878
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Annual Financial Statement, Comm. 1343, 1346, 1348, 1353, 1354
Parliament—Business of the House, 1062, 1063, 1582, 1583
Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24, Res. 270, 272

HASTINGS, Mr. G. W., *Worcestershire, E.*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 732; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 809
Supply—Prisons, Ireland, 364

HAY, Admiral Right Hon. Sir J. C. D., *Wigtown, &c.*
Army—Commissariat Staff—Royal Marines, 1567
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1208
Defences of the Empire—Defence of the Seaports, 60
Navy—Questions
Accountant General of the Navy, 1052
Constitution of the Admiralty—A Finance Lord, 1051
Evolutionary Squadron, 1731;—H.M.S. "Ajax," 243
H.M.S. "Cruiser," 514
Parliament—Business of the House, 1583
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. 946

HAYTER, Colonel Sir A. D., *Bath*
Army—Military Farms at Aldershot, 1577
Army (Auxiliary Forces)—The Northampton Volunteers, 1278
Army Estimates—Warlike Stores, 141
War Office, 168
Widows' Pensions, &c. 172
Supply, Report, Res. 2, 540

HEALY, Mr. T. M., *Monaghan*
Administration of Oaths (Canada), 1728
Educational Endowments (Ireland), 2R. 1856; Comm. 1895; *cl.* 4, 1899; *cl.* 5, 1901; *cl.* 16, 1905; *cl.* 17, 1906; *add. cl.* 1912; Preamble, 1913
Ireland—Law and Police—Affray in Co. Monaghan, 1740, 1741, 1871
Registration of Voters—Assistant Revising Barristers, 1730, 1872
Labourers (Ireland) Act (No. 2), Lords Amendts. Consid. 1891, 1893
Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, 1647, 1658, 1659, 1662; *cl.* 8, 1683; *cl.* 13, 1687; *cl.* 17, 1689, 1693; *add. cl.* 1704; Consid. *add. cl.* 1842; Amendt. 1846, 1848
Moveable Dwellings, 2R. 1705, 1706
Poor Law Unions' Officers, Lords Amendts. Consid. 1914
Prevention of Crimes Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, Motion for reporting Progress, 1857, 1858

HENDERSON, Mr. F., *Dundee*
Universities (Scotland), 2R. 631

HENNIKER, Lord
Parliament—Palace of Westminster—House of Lords—Frescoes in the Peers' Robing Room, 14
Science and Art—Site of the National Gallery, 502

HENRY, Mr. M., *Galway Co.*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* 878, 883
General Gordon—Design for a Statue, 837
Supply, Report, Res. 4, 551, 553

HERSCHELL, Sir F., *Durham*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 601, 610, 619; *cl.* 4, 737, 763; *cl.* 5, 778, 781; Consid. *add. cl.* 1387
Evidence by Commission, Comm. 207
Lunacy Acts Amendment, 2R. 208
Patent Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 210
Supply—Prisons, Ireland, 378, 379

HICKS, Mr. E., *Cambridgeshire*
Law and Police—Use of Bicycles on Public Roads—Furious Driving, 249
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), Comm. *add. cl.* 203

HILL, Mr. A. S., *Staffordshire, W.*
Cattle Importation — Canadian and American Cattle, 1736
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* 856, 872, 881, 891, 901, 907; Amendt. 909, 910, 916; Consid. *add. cl.* 1387; Amendt. 1389, 1391, 1396, 1405, 1407, 1417, 1420
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1800, 1801, 1807; *cl.* 13, 1826, 1829; *cl.* 14, 1831, 1834

HILL, Mr. T. R., *Worcester*
Worcester Extension, Lords Amendts. Consid. *cl.* 21 A, 660

Hobhouse, Lord
Copyhold Enfranchisement, 2R. 482

Holland, Sir H. T. (Financial Secretary to the Treasury), *Midhurst*
Army Estimates—Provisions, Forage, &c. 82, 83
Commissioners of Customs—A Report, 829
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 739
East India Army Pensions Deficiency, 2R. 811
Educational Endowments (Ireland), Comm. *add. cl.* 1912
Inland Revenue—Stamps—Stamp Distributors in Dublin, 510
Ireland—Questions
Court of Bankruptcy—Copying Clerks, 511
Fishery Piers and Harbours—Greystones Harbour, 1722
Inland Navigation and Drainage—Kilkee Drainage, 1043, 1456
Law and Justice — Court of Bankruptcy, Dublin, 61
Piers and Harbours—Kingstown Pier, 816
Post Office—New Post Office at Mullingar, 1871
Public Works—Mail Jetty at Holyhead, 60
Registry of Deeds Act, 1883, 819
Registry of Deeds Office, Dublin, 61
Relief of Distress Act, 1880—Loans—Co. Donegal, 831
Sligo Harbour Commissioners—Charges for Mooring—Loan for Improvements, 829
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 991; *cl.* 18, 1012
Parliament—Adjournment, 475
Post Office — Mails to the Western Islands, 1269
Public Works Loans, Comm. *add. cl.* 982
Stationery Office — Contracts for Government Printing, 249, 676
Supply—Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, 446
Prisons, Ireland, 377
Temporary Commissions and Committees, &c. 178

Hollond, Mr. J. R., *Brighton*
Housing of the Working Classes (England), 2R. 1606; Comm. *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1769, 1770, 1796; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1820; *cl.* 5, 1823

Holmes, Right Hon. H. (Attorney General for Ireland), *Dublin University*
County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (Pensions), Comm. *add. cl.* 1514, 1517, 1521, 1522
Educational Endowments (Ireland), 2R. 1855; Comm. 1893; *cl.* 1, Amendt. *ib.*, 1896; *cl.* 3, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 4, 1897; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1900, 1901; *cl.* 6, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1902; *cl.* 8, *ib.*; *cl.* 9, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1903; *cl.* 12, *ib.*, 1904; *cl.* 13, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 15, Amendt. *ib.*: *cl.* 16, 1905; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 1906; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 1907; *cl.* 22, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 23, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 24, *ib.*; *cl.* 25, Amendt. 1908; *cl.* 27, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 28, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 34, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 38, Amendt. 1909; *cl.* 39, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 40, Amendt. *ib.*, 1910; *add. cl. ib.* 1911, 1912; Preamble, Amendt. *ib.*, 1913
Ireland—Questions
Arrears of Rent Act, 1882—Case of Mr. Templeman, Agent to Mr. S. C. Armstrong, 825
Parliamentary Elections—Co. Down Election—Ballot Act, 512, 513
Poor Law Guardians—Lords Amendts., 1063, 1454
Registration of Voters Act — Additional Revising Barristers, 1872;—Clerk of the Peace, Sligo Co., 1565;—Co. Antrim, 839
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 2, 984, 985; *cl.* 4, 987, 989, 990; *cl.* 8, 993, 994, 995; *cl.* 12, 997, 998, 1001, 1002; *cl.* 13, 1003; *cl.* 14, 1004; *cl.* 15, 1005, 1006, 1007, 1008; *cl.* 16, 1010; *cl.* 18, 1011, 1012, 1013; *add. cl.* 1015, 1017, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024, 1025; Consid. *cl.* 12, 1193; *add. cl.* 1194; Lords Amendts. Consid. 1890, 1891, 1894
Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1113; Comm. Motion for Adjournment, 1622; *cl.* 2, 1642, 1644, 1660; *cl.* 3, 1663, 1665, 1666; *cl.* 5, 1675, 1677; *cl.* 6, 1678; *cl.* 7, 1679; *cl.* 8, 1681, 1682, 1683, 1684; *cl.* 9, *ib.*, 1685; *cl.* 13, 1687, 1688; *cl.* 15, *ib.*; *cl.* 17, 1692, 1694; *cl.* 23, 1695; *add. cl.* 1698, 1699, 1700, 1701, 1702, 1704; Consid. *add. cl.* 1840; Amendt. 1845, 1846; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1849; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1850; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1851; *cl.* 9, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 15, 1852; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1853; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 1854; *cl.* 18, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 21, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 25, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 26, Amendt. *ib.*
Parliament—Business of the House, 848
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), Comm. *add. cl.* 196, 197
Poor Law Unions' Officers (Ireland), Lords Amendts. Consid. 1913
Registration Appeals (Ireland), Comm. 1522

Home, Lieutenant-Colonel D. Milne, *Berwick-on-Tweed*
Army Education — Staff College — Oriental Languages, 52

Home Department—Secretary of State (*see* Cross, Right Hon. Sir R. Assheton)

Home Department—Under Secretary of State (*see* Wortley, Mr. C. B. Stuart-)

Hopwood, Mr. C. H., *Stockport*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. Amendt. 579, 590; *cl.* 2, 593, 601, 613, 618; Amendt. 620, 621; Motion for reporting Progress, 622; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 623, 624, 627, 629, 688, 692, 693, 698, 706, 710, 715; *cl.* 4, *ib.*, 719, 726, 733, 750, 759, 764; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 766, 767, 772, 775, 777, 782; *cl.* 6, 786, 791; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 796, 797, 805; *add. cl.* 855, 866, 871, 907, 909, 912, 915; Consid. *add. cl.* 1393, 1398, 1400; *cl.* 1, Amendt.

[*cont.*

Hopwood, Mr. C. H.—*cont.*
1461; *cl.* 3, 1468; *cl.* 4, 1472; Amendt. 1474, 1479; *cl.* 5, 1480, 1481; Amendt. 1483, 1484, 1485; *cl.* 9, 1498; *cl.* 10, 1505; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1508
Factory Acts (Extension to Shops), 521
Housing of the Working Classes (England), 2R. 1621; Comm. 1755; *cl.* 3, 1772, 1794; *cl.* 5, 1822; *cl.* 13, 1825
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Release of —— Briggs, a Convict, 840
Law and Police—Eliza Armstrong, a Child under 14 Years, 1739
Prevention of Crimes Amendment, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, 211

Houghton, Lord
Scottish and Irish Peerages, Bill withdrawn, 813

Housing of the Working Classes (England) Bill
Question, Mr. Gray; Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour), The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *July* 30, 522; Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *July* 31, 679; Questions, Mr. Courtney; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Observations, Mr. Broadhurst, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 3, 846; Questions, Mr. Gray, Mr. Broadhurst; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 4, 1063; Question, Sir Charles W. Dilke; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 7, 1508

Housing of the Working Classes (England) Bill [H.L.]
(*Sir R. Assheton Cross*)
c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Aug* 10, 1585
Amendt. to leave out from "That," add "it is inexpedient at this stage of the Session to initiate legislation involving the principle of a National subsidy towards aiding any locality in providing dwellings for the working class in such locality" (*Mr. Lyulph Stanley*) *v.*; Question proposed, "That the words, &c.;" after debate, Question put, and agreed to; main Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2° [Bill 248]
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Aug* 11, 1745; after debate, Question put; A. 59, N. 6; M. 53 (D. L. 282); Committee; Report
Considered *Aug* 12, 1888; after short debate, Queen's Consent signified; Bill read 3°

Housing of the Working Classes—Sites of the Metropolitan Prisons
Questions, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Courtney; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 27, 65

Hubbard, Right Hon. J. G., *London*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 747; *cl.* 5, 774
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. 1747
Land Purchase (Ireland), 1452
Supply, Report, Res. 3, 546
Telegraph Acts Amendment, Comm. 555

Iddesleigh, Earl of (First Lord of the Treasury)
Customs Department—Collectors of Customs, 658
Depression of Trade and Industry, Royal Commission on the—Constitution of the Commission, 1531, 1544, 1545;—Personal Explanation, 1868
Literature, Science, and Art—National Gallery—Evening Opening, 1719
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 32
Parliament—Palace of Westminster—House of Lords — Frescoes in the Peers' Robing Room, 16
Public Offices Site Act, 1882, 1717
Public Offices, The New—Designs for New War Office and Admiralty, 1032
Telegraph Acts Amendment, 2R. 1027

Illingworth, Mr. A., *Bradford*
Supply—Commissioners of National Education, Ireland, 394

Ince, Mr. H. B., *Hastings*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* 1864, 1872; Consid. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1484
High Court of Justice—Report of Committee of Inquiry, 1062
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 13, 1829
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 4, 991

India (*Miscellaneous Questions*)
Madras Presidency—Revolt of Talooks, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord Randolph Churchill) *July* 27, 51
The Indian Civil Service—Age of Candidates, Question, Mr. Thorold Rogers; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord Randolph Churchill) *July* 30, 513
Railways (India)
Indian Midland Railway, Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord Randolph Churchill) *July* 30, 507
The Candahar and Quetta Railway, Questions, Sir Henry Tyler, Mr. Buchanan; Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Lord Randolph Churchill) *July* 30, 523

India—East India (Revenue Accounts)—The Annual Financial Statement
Question, Sir Robert Fowler; Answers, The Secretary of State for India (Lord Randolph Churchill), The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 30, 526; Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Secretary of State for India (Lord Randolph Churchill) *July* 31, 676

[*cont.*

India — East India (Revenue Accounts) — The Annual Financial Statement—cont.

Ordered, That the several Accounts and Papers which have been presented to the House in this Session of Parliament, relating to the Revenues of India, be referred to the consideration of a Committee of the whole House" *Aug* 3

Resolved, That this House will, upon Thursday, resolve itself into the said Committee

Considered in Committee *Aug* 6, 1286

Moved, "That it appears, by the Accounts laid before this House, that the total Revenue of India for the year ending the 31st day of March 1884 was £71,727,421, including £13,240,507 received from Productive Public Works; that the Total Expenditure in India and in England was £70,339,925, including £12,032,754 spent on Productive Public Works (Revenue Account); that there was an excess of Revenue over Expenditure in that year of £1,387,496; and that the Capital Expenditure on Productive Public Works in the same year was £3,992,029, including a Charge of £566,261 incurred in the redemption of previously existing liabilities" (*Lord Randolph Churchill*); after long debate, Question put, and agreed to

Resolution reported *Aug* 7

INDIA—Secretary of State (*see* CHURCHILL, Right Hon. Lord R. H. S.)

Infants Bill [H.L.] (*Mr. Bryce*)

c. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2°" *Aug* 3, 1025; Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Onslow*); Question put; A. 17, N. 54; M. 37 (D. L. 269)

Original Question put, and agreed to; Bill read 2° [Bill 157]

Committee deferred *Aug* 11, 1856

IRELAND (*Miscellaneous Questions*)

Court of Bankruptcy—Copying Clerks, Question, Mr. Findlater; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *July* 30, 511

Depression of Trade—A Royal Commission, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 27, 66

Industries—A Royal Commission, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 31, 677

Local Government Board—The Clerk to the Bangor Town Commissioners, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 4, 1039

Parliamentary Elections—The County Down Election—The Ballot Act, Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. Gray; Answers, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes), The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *July* 30, 512

Public Meetings—The Meeting at Dromore, 1883—Death of —— Giffen, Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 10, 1571

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Public Works—Deductions from Road Contractors' Accounts—Mr. F. Morris, Secretary to Grand Jury, Co. Clare, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 4, 1047

Registry of Deeds (Ireland) Act, 1883, Question, Mr. Findlater; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *Aug* 3, 818

Registry of Deeds Office, Dublin, Question, Colonel King-Harman; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *July* 27, 60

Relief of Distress (Ireland) Act, 1880—*Loans — Co. Donegal*, Questions, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *Aug* 3, 830

Science and Art Department, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 10, 1572

Seed Supply (Ireland) Act—Non-Payment of the Seed Rate, Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 31, 679

The Coastguard — The Divisional Officer at Dundalk, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *July* 30, 526

The Irish Administration—Mr. E. G. Jenkinson, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 4, 1038

The Royal University of Ireland—Examinations, Question, Mr. Justin M'Carthy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 28, 244

Tramways and Public Companies (Ireland) Act, 1883, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 30, 509

Roads and Bridges (Ireland)

The Tour Slate Quarries—Bridge over the River Suir, Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 27, 55

Fisheries (Ireland)

Fishery Laws—The River Suir—Case of —— O'Shea and others, Question, Mr. R. Power; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 27, 53

The Foyle and the Bann, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 6, 1271

The River Shannon—The Limerick Board of Conservators, Questions, Colonel King-Harman, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 27, 49

Lunatic Asylums (Ireland)

Appointments of Medical Officers, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 27, 45

Lunatics—Armagh Lunatic Asylum, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 6, 1270

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

National Education (*Ireland*)

Board of Intermediate Education—Examinations, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 27, 58;—*Examination of Girls*, Question, Mr. James Stuart; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 30, 520

Board of National Education—Extra Instruction, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 27, 58

Commissioners of National Education—Erection of New Schools—Building Materials, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 10, 1570;—*National School Teachers—Case of Mr. Andrew Devitt, Porrelsborough*, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 11, 1722;—*Assistant Teachers*, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 3, 824

Education Office—The Inspection Staff, Questions, Mr. Sexton, Mr. Biggar; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 11, 1723

Industrial School at Ballaghadarreen, Co. Mayo, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 7, 1451

The Model School, Kilkenny, Question, Mr. Marum; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 3, 841

The Schoolmaster of Stranagomis National School, Co. Tyrone, Question, Mr. Macartney; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 30, 504

Poor Law (*Ireland*)

Bantry Union, Question, Mr. Deasy; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 28, 245

Belfast Union Workhouse—Charge of Drunkenness against the Schoolmasters, Questions, Mr. Biggar; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 7, 1450; *Aug* 11, 1724

Clones Union Workhouse — Mr. Wiggins, Master of the, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 11, 1724

Cootehill Union—Mr. Graham, Clerk to the Board of Guardians, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 27, 47

Lurgan Union—Dr. John Scott, Medical Officer, Questions, Mr. Biggar; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 4, 1037; *Aug* 11, 1720

Galway and Arran Island Dispensaries, Question, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 30, 519

Post Office (*Ireland*)

A Rural Letter Carrier, Co. Cavan, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 6, 1266

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*Post Office*—cont.

Sunday Mail to Achill Island, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 3, 831

Tampering with Letters, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 4, 1041

Sorters in Irish Mail Trains, Questions, Mr. Harrington, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 3, 832

The Dublin Sorting Office, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *July* 28, 247

The New Post Office at Mullingar, Question, Mr. T. D. Sullivan; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *Aug* 12, 1871

Inland Navigation and Drainage (*Ireland*)

Floods in Co. Clare, Question, The O'Gorman Mahon; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *Aug* 7, 1455

The Kilkee Drainage, Question, The O'Gorman Mahon; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *Aug* 4, 1043

Fishery Piers and Harbours (*Ireland*)

Greystones Harbour, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *Aug* 11, 1722

Sligo Harbour Commissioners — Charges for Mooring—Loan for Improvements, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *Aug* 3, 829

Piers and Harbours (*Ireland*)

Kingstown Pier, Question, Mr. Maurice Brooks; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *Aug* 3, 816

Law and Justice (*Ireland*)

Mr. F. Falkiner, Q.C., Recorder of Dublin, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 3, 839

Petty Sessions Clerk, Mullaghroe Petty Sessions District, Co. Sligo, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 4, 1037

The Bailiff to the Sheriff of Meath Co., Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 10, 1567

The Court of Bankruptcy, Dublin, Question, Mr. Findlater; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *July* 27, 61

The Court of Queen's Bench (*Fines and Penalties Office*)—*Mr. O'Brien, M.P.*, Questions, Mr. M'Coan; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke), Mr. Speaker *Aug* 3, 822

The Earl of Belfast, Clerk of the Peace, Co. Antrim, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 27, 53

The Magistracy (*Ireland*)

Mr. Hans White, J.P., Question, Mr. Arthur O'Connor; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 12, 1871

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*cont.*

Law and Police (Ireland)

Cork County Police, Questions, Mr. Biggar, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 31, 667

Detention of Intoxicated Persons, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 11, 1725

Fines for Dangerous Use of Fireworks at Ballinrobe, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 10, 1571

Illegal Fishing in Kildare—Insanitary Houses at Kill, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 4, 1048

The Riot in Co. Monaghan, Questions, Mr. Healy; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 11, 1740; *Aug* 12, 1871

Waterford Free Force, Question, Mr. P. J. Power; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 3, 826

Royal Irish Constabulary

Appointment of Medical Officers, Question, Mr. T. D. Sullivan; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 27, 57

Extra Police at Gweedore, Co. Donegal, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 27, 47

Extra Police, Limerick, Question, Mr. Lewis; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 6, 1277

Extra Police at Portadown, Questions, Mr. Macartney; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 30, 505

Extra Police and Hut at Lisdoonvarna, Co. Clare, Question, Mr. Kenny; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 30, 508

Pensioners, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 27, 50

Promotion of Head Constables, Question, Mr. Beresford; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 4, 1048

Protection Post at Bunduff, Co. Leitrim, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 4, 1038

Pursuit of Poachers, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 11, 1721

Registration of Voters (Ireland) Act

Assistant Revising Barristers, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 7, 1457; Questions, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Healy; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 11, 1730; Question Mr. Healy; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 12, 1872

Co. Antrim, Questions, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke), The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 3, 837

[*cont.*

IRELAND—*Registration of Voters Act*—cont.

Revision Courts, Co. Cavan, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 6, 1270; —*Tyrone and Donegal*, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke), 1273

Revision Sessions — Kilmacthomas Union, Question, Mr. P. J. Power; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 3, 826

Supplemental Lists, Armagh Co.—Printing the Lists, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 27, 59; Questions, Mr. O'Brien; Answers, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 3, 827

Publication of Lists of Voters—Derry, Question, Mr. O'Brien; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 3, 842

Publication of Lists of Voters in North Antrim, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 4, 1055

Publication of Lists, Sligo Co., Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 6, 1272

The Clerk of the Peace, Sligo Co., Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 10, 1565

[See titles *Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Act*, 1882
„ *Land Law (Ireland) Act*, 1881 —*Irish Land Commission*]

JAMES, Right Hon. Sir H., *Taunton*

Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 592, 595; Amendt. 601; *cl.* 3, 703, 706; *cl.* 4, 745, 757; *cl.* 5, 776; *add. cl.* 887, 890, 909, 910, 911, 912, 919; Consid. *add. cl.* 1398, 1401, 1403; Amendt. 1405, 1406, 1417; *cl.* 2, 1464; Amendt. 1465, 1466; *cl.* 3, 1467; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1470, 1472, 1473, 1474; *cl.* 5, 1484, 1485; *cl.* 9, 1494; Amendt. 1495, 1500; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1503, 1504, 1508

Electoral Acts—Distribution, 1741

Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 13, 1827

Parliament—Business of the House—Prorogation, Ministerial Statement, 1744

Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), Comm. *add. cl.* 200, 203; Amendt. 204, 205, 206

Police Enfranchisement Extension, Comm. 1251

Representation of the People Act, 1884—Police Enfranchisement, 1460

JENKINS, Mr. D. J., *Penryn, &c.*

Law and Police (Scotland)—Illegal Impounding of Children, 505

Representation of the People Act, 1884—The Parliamentary Franchise (Scotland) — Crofters under £10 Rental, 505

KENNARD, Mr. C. J., *Salisbury*

Parliament—Business of the House, 848;—Prorogation, Ministerial Statement, 1743

[*cont.*

KENNARD, Mr. C. J.—*cont.*
  Police Enfranchisement Extension, 674
  Representation of the People Act, 1884—Police Enfranchisement, 1459

KENNAWAY, Sir J. H., *Devon, E.*
  Post Office—Pre-payment of Postage, 56

KENNY, Mr. M. J., *Ennis*
  Ireland—Education—Irish National Teachers—Assistant Teachers, 824
    Royal Irish Constabulary—Extra Police and Hut at Lisdoonvarna, Co. Clare, 508
  Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, 1668
  Moveable Dwellings, 2R. 1705
  Supply—Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 354

KING-HARMAN, Colonel E. R., *Dublin Co.*
  Army (Auxiliary Forces)—4th Royal Fusiliers (Cavan Militia)—Major Lionel Brooke, 1450
  Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 6, 789
  Educational Endowments (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 5, 1900; *cl.* 16, 1905; *cl.* 27, 1908
  Egypt (Military Expedition)—Troops at Suakin, 835;—Supplies for, 1275
  Ireland—Questions
    Fisheries—River Shannon—Limerick Board of Conservators, 49
    Irish Land Commission—New Commissioners, 843
    Registry of Deeds Office, Dublin, 60
  Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 2, 984, 985; *cl.* 4, Amendt. *ib.* 988, 992; *cl.* 8, 993, 994, 995; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 996, 997, 998, 999, 1000; *cl.* 13, 1003; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1004; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1005, 1007; *cl.* 18, 1014; Motion for reporting Progress, *ib.*; *add. cl.* 1018, 1025; Consid. *cl.* 12, 1193; *cl.* 17, *ib.*; *add. cl. ib.* 1194; Lords Amendts. Consid. 1891, 1894
  Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1074, 1088; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1637, 1647, 1653, 1659; *cl.* 3, 1664; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1687; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 1688, 1691; *add. cl.* 1698, 1699; Consid. *add. cl.* 1841, 1844, 1847; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1852; *cl.* 15, *ib.*
  Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Lords Amendts. Consid. 1558; *cl.* B, 1562

LABOUCHERE, Mr. H., *Northampton*
  Army—Small Arm Ammunition—The Boxer Cartridge, 1041
  Army Estimates—Provisions, Forage, &c. 106
    War Office, Amendt. 169
  Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. Amendt. 1200, 1208, 1214, 1215
  County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (Pensions), Comm. *add. cl.* 1518
  Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 604, 605, 606; *cl.* 3, 699, 705; *cl.* 4, 742; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 786, 787; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 794, 795; *add. cl.* 896, 897, 900, 902; Consid. *add. cl.* 1397, 1398, 1405; *cl.* 10, 1504, 1505
  Ecclesiastical Commissioners—Taxation of Legal Expenses, 510

[*cont.*

LABOUCHERE, Mr. H.—*cont.*
  Egypt—Questions
    International Guaranteed Loan, 516, 518, 671
    Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff, 242
    Soudan—Garrison of Kassala, 64, 667
  Morocco—Suppression of Journals, 669
  Parliament—Business of the House, 681, 847, 848, 1285
  Parliamentary Elections—Eye Election, 527
  Parliamentary Elections (Ireland)—Co. Down Election—Ballot Act, 512
  Peru and Chili—Peruvian Bondholders, 1057
  Post Office—Registration of Telegraphic Addresses, 1459
  Public Health—Cholera in Spain, 521
  Ramsden Estate, 3R. 1200
  Supply—Civil Contingencies Fund, &c. 190
    Marlborough House, 184
    Post Office Packet Service, 181
    Report, Res. 4, 552

Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2) Bill
(*Mr. Campbell-Bannerman, Mr. Solicitor General for Ireland*)
c. Committee; Report *Aug* 3, 983 [Bill 68]
  Considered *Aug* 4, 1192; after short debate, Moved, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect of two New Clauses"
  Amendt. to leave out "two," insert "four" (*Colonel King-Harman*) *v.*; Question, "That 'two' &c.," put and negatived; "four" inserted
  Committee; Report; Considered; read 3°
l. Read 1ª * (*M. of Waterford*) *Aug* 5 (No. 235)
  Read 2ª, after short debate *Aug* 6, 1264
  Committee, after short debate *Aug* 7, 1436
  Moved, "That the Report of the Amendments be now received" *Aug* 10, 1546; after short debate, on Question? Cont. 43, Not-Cont. 5; M. 38; resolved in the affirmative (No. 241)
  Read 3ª * *Aug* 11 (No. 245)
c. Lords' Amendts. considered *Aug* 12, 1889; several disagreed to
  Committee appointed, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to several of the Amendts. made by the Lords to the said Bill;" List of the Committee, 1894
  Reasons for disagreeing to the Lords Amendts. reported, and agreed to; to be communicated to the Lords

LAMINGTON, Lord
  Parliament—Palace of Westminster—House of Lords—Frescoes in the Peers' Robing Room, 13
  Science and Art—Site of the National Gallery, 501

LANCASTER—Chancellor of the Duchy (*see* CHAPLIN, Right Hon. H.)

Land Law (Ireland) Act, 1881—*The Irish Land Commission*
  The Appeal Court—Appeals from Tenants on Lord Rosse's Estate, Parsonstown, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *Aug* 10, 1578

[*cont.*

Land Law (*Ireland*) *Act*, 1881—*The Irish Land Commission*—cont.
The Sub-Commissioners, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 31, 677
The New Commissioners, Question, Colonel King-Harman; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 3, 843

Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Chief Secretary for Ireland*)
c. Read 2°, after long debate *Aug* 4, 1065 [Bill 249]
Questions, Mr. J. G. Hubbard, General Sir George Balfour; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 7, 1452
Committee; Report *Aug* 10, 1621
Considered; (Queen's consent signified); Bill read 3° *Aug* 11, 1840

Land Purchase (*Ireland*) [*Salaries*]
Res. considered in Committee, and agreed to *Aug* 4, 1194
Res. reported *Aug* 5

Land Purchase (*Ireland*) [*Advances*]
Res. considered in Committee, and agreed to *Aug* 6, 1428
Res. reported *Aug* 7, 1522; after short debate, Res. agreed to

LAW AND JUSTICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)
(*Miscellaneous Questions*)
High Court of Justice—Report of Committee of Inquiry, Question, Mr. Ince; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) *Aug* 4, 1062
The Jeffries' Case—Mr. Edlin, Q.C. (*Assistant Judge*), Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *July* 30, 518; Questions, Mr. Picton, Mr. Callan; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *July* 31, 672; Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Sir William Harcourt *Aug* 3, 843
Suppression of Disorderly Houses—Case of Mrs. Jeffries, Question, Mr. Callan; Answer, Mr. Tomlinson *Aug* 12, 1870
Release of——Briggs, a Convict, Question, Mr. Hopwood; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 3, 840
The Birmingham Assizes—Sheriffs' Expenses, Question, Mr. Sampson Lloyd; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 30, 514
The Circuit Arrangements, Question, Mr. Whitley; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *July* 31, 673; Question, Mr. Warton; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) *Aug* 3, 817

LAW AND POLICE (ENGLAND AND WALES)
(*Miscellaneous Questions*)
Eliza Armstrong, a Child under 14 Years of Age, Questions, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck, Mr. Hopwood; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 11, 1739

[*cont.*

LAW AND POLICE (*England and Wales*)—cont.
Political Clubs, Questions, Mr. M'Laren; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 10, 1569
The International Club, Question, Observations, The Earl of Wemyss; Reply, The Paymaster General (Earl Beauchamp) *July* 28, 236
The "Pall Mall Gazette"—Publication of Offensive Articles, Question, Mr. P. A. Muntz; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *July* 27, 51
Use of Bicycles on Public Roads—Furious Driving, Question, Mr. Hicks; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *July* 28, 249

LAWRENCE, Mr. Alderman W., *London*
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. 1746; *cl.* 3, 1792
Telegraph Acts Amendment, 679, 680; Comm. 554; 3R. Amendt. 810

LAWSON, Sir W., *Carlisle*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1207, 1208
Earldom of Mar Restitution, Comm. 685
Prince Henry of Battenberg's Naturalization, 681; Comm. *ib.* 682
Supply, Report, Res. 4, 551
Supplementary Estimate—Gordon Monument, 468

LEA, Mr. T., *Donegal*
Educational Endowments (Ireland), 2R. 1853
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 12, 1002
Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, 1670
Land Purchase (Ireland) [Advances], Res. [6th August], Report, 1523

LEAMY, Mr. E., *Waterford*
Egypt—Colonel de Coetlogon, 674

LECHMERE, Sir E. A. H., *Worcestershire, W.*
Customs and Inland Revenue (No. 2), Consid. *cl.* 25, 195

LEFEVRE, Right Hon. G. J. Shaw, *Reading*
Depression of Trade and Industry, Royal Commission on—Constitution of the Commission, 1580
Housing of the Working Classes—Sites of the Metropolitan Prisons, 65
Housing of the Working Classes (England), 2R. 1613; Comm. *cl.* 3, 1776, 1788, 1797, 1798, 1801, 1802, 1804; *cl.* 5, 1822
Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1086, 1088; Comm. 1639; *cl.* 2, 1648; Amendt. 1657, 1659
Parliament—Business of the House, 525
Supply—Prisons, Ireland, 378
Telegraph Acts Amendment, 680; Comm. 556; *cl.* 2, 567; Motion for reporting Progress, 577; 3R. 809; Amendt. 810

LEIGHTON, Sir B., *Shropshire, S.*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 598, 622; *cl.* 3, 713; *cl.* 5, 768

LEWIS, Mr. C. E., *Londonderry*
Ireland—Law and Police—Extra Police, Limerick, 1277
Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1081, 1082
Parliament—Public Business, 66
Supply—Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 313, 314
Report, Res. 1, 529

Licensing Laws Amendment Bill (*Mr. Stafford Howard, Mr. Houldsworth*)
c. Bill withdrawn * *July* 30 [Bill 226]

LIMERICK, Earl of
Customs Department—Collectors of Customs, 658
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 36

Literature, Science and Art
Examinations in Drawing—Failures to Pass, Question, Mr. Picton; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) *July* 31, 678
Site of the National Portrait Gallery, Observations, Lord Lamington; Reply, Lord Henniker *July* 30, 501
Evening Opening, Question, Observations, The Marquess of Lothian; Reply, The First Lord of the Treasury (The Earl of Iddesleigh) *Aug* 11, 1718

LLOYD, Mr. M., *Beaumaris*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1250
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *add. cl.* 1387, 1389, 1390
Education Department—College at Aberystwith, 842
Police Enfranchisement Extension, Comm. Motion for Adjournment, 1251
Public Works—Mail Jetty at Holyhead, 60

LLOYD, Mr. S. S., *Warwickshire, S.*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 725, 726
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Birmingham Assizes—Sheriffs' Expenses, 514

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD—President (*see* BALFOUR, Right Hon. A. J.)

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD—Secretary to (*see* BROWNLOW, Earl)

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders Bill (*The Lord President*)
l. Committee *Aug* 6, 1252 (No. 170)
Report; read 3ª *Aug* 7, 1429
On Motion, "That the Bill do pass?" after short debate, Motion agreed to
c. Lords' Amendts. considered *Aug* 10, 1558; one agreed to; one disagreed to
Committee appointed, "to draw up Reasons to be assigned to the Lords for disagreeing to the Amendt. to which this House hath disagreed;" List of the Committee, 1564

[*cont.*

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders Bill—cont.
l. Commons' Reasons for disagreeing to one of the Amendts. made by the Lords considered *Aug* 11, 1706; Moved, "That the House do not insist upon their Amendt. to which the Commons have disagreed" (*The Marquess of Waterford*)
Amendt. to leave out all after ("That"), insert ("this House, insisting on its Amendment, do now proceed to appoint a Committee to meet and confer with a Committee of the Commons" (*The Lord FitzGerald*); after short debate, on Question, "That the words, &c.?" Cont. 21, Not-Cont. 10; M. 11; resolved in the affirmative
Amendt. not insisted on, and a message sent to the Commons to acquaint them therewith

Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders (Public Health Act) (No. 2) Bill [H.L.]
c. Report * *July* 28 [Bill 212]
Read 3° * *July* 29
l. Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. cxxx]

Local Government Provisional Orders (No. 6) Bill (*The Lord Carrington*)
l. Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. cxxviii]

LONDON, Bishop of
Pluralities, 2R. 493

LONGFORD, Earl of
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 31

LORD LIEUTENANT OF IRELAND—Chief Secretary to the (*see* DYKE, Right Hon. Sir W. H.)

LORD PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL (*see* CRANBROOK, Viscount)

Loss of Life at Sea, Royal Commission on
The Evidence, Questions, Mr. Atkinson; Answers, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 3, 841; *Aug* 4, 1060

Lotteries Act—Foreign Lotteries
Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, The Solicitor General (Sir John Gorst) *Aug* 7, 1453

LOTHIAN, Marquess of
Army—Army Reserve—End of Service with the Colours, 1545
Glencorse Military Prison, 212
Literature, Science, and Art—The National Gallery—Evening Opening, 1718
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 35
Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment, Commons Amendts. Consid. 1716

LOWTHER, Right Hon. J., *Lincolnshire, N.*
  Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1465

LUBBOCK, Sir J., *London University*
  Factory Acts (Extension to Shops), 521
  Secretary for Scotland, Comm. *cl.* 5, 1132, 1137; *cl.* 6, 1170
  Supply—South Africa and St. Helena, 463

Lunacy Acts Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Arthur Balfour, Mr. Stuart-Wortley*)
c. Read 2°, after debate *July* 27, 208 [Bill 244]
  Committee; Report; read 3° *July* 28, 382
l. Read 1ª* (*E. Brownlow*) *July* 30 (No. 221)
  Read 2ª *July* 31, 659
  Committee*; Report *Aug* 3
  Read 3ª* *Aug* 4
  Royal Assent *Aug* 6 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 52]

LYMINGTON, Viscount, *Barnstaple*
  Western Pacific—New Guinea—Form of Government for the English Portion, 1046

LYNCH, Mr. N., *Sligo Co.*
  Supply—Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, 452

MCARTHUR, Mr. A., *Leicester*
  Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *add. cl.* 1402, 1419
  Supply, Report, Res. 2, 541

MACARTNEY, Mr. J. W. E., *Tyrone*
  Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 721
  Ireland—Questions
    National Education — Schoolmaster of Stranagomis National School, Co. Tyrone, 504
    Public Meetings—Meeting at Dromore, 1883—Death of —— Giffen, 1571
    Royal Irish Constabulary—Extra Police at Portadown, 505
  Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1100

M'CARTHY, Mr. J., *Longford*
  Ireland — Royal University — Examinations, 244
    Seed Supply Act—Non-payment of the Seed Rate, 679
  Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24, Res. 266
  Supply—Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, 421
    Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 307

M'CARTHY, Mr. J. H., *Athlone Bo.*
  Explosives Act—Appointment of Mr. James Martin, Inspector for Brawney and Athlone, 1057
  Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24, Res. 299

M'CLURE, Sir T., *Londonderry Co.*
  Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1100

M'COAN, Mr. J. C., *Wicklow*
  Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1226, 1245
  Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, 697, 709, 712; *cl.* 4, 751; *add. cl.* 859, 860, 873, 906; Amendt. 907; Consid. *add. cl.* 1412; *cl.* 5, 1481; *cl.* 9, 1501, 1502, 1503, 1504; *cl.* 10, Amendt. 1506
  Egypt—Assembly of Notables, 669
    Military Expedition to the Soudan—Lord Wolseley's Report, 1064
  Ireland—Law and Justice—Court of Queen's Bench (Fines and Penalties Office)—Mr. O'Brien, M.P. 822, 823
  Morocco—Suppression of Journals, 670
  Treaty of Berlin—Article LXI.—Reforms in Armenia, 835

MCKENNA, Sir J. N., *Youghal*
  Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* 885
  Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 8, 994; *cl.* 12, 997, 999; *add. cl.* 1021
  Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1666, 1668; *cl.* 5, 1676; *cl.* 7, 1679; *cl.*3, 1683; *add. cl.* 1704; Consid. *add. cl.* 1847
  Supply—Disturnpiked and Main Roads in England and Wales, 381
    Report, Res. 1, 530

MACKINTOSH, Mr. C. FRASER-, *Inverness, &c.*
  Scotland—Public Health—Insanitary Condition of Duthil Churchyard, 46

MCLAREN, Mr. C. B. B., *Stafford*
  Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *add. cl.* 1491
  Egypt—Mission of Sir H. Drummond Wolff, 241
  Law and Police—Political Clubs, 1569

MAKINS, Colonel W. T., *Essex, S.*
  Southwark and Vauxhall Water, 2R. 238, 241

Malta—Examinations for the Public Service (Army, Navy, and Civil)
  Observations, Earl De La Warr, Viscount Enfield; Reply, The Under Secretary of State for the Colonies (The Earl of Dunraven) *July* 27, 4

MANNERS, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R. (Postmaster General), *Leicestershire, N.*
  Arrears of Rent (Ireland) Act, 1882—Case of Mr. Templeman, Agent to Mr. S. C. Armstrong, 825
  Post Office—Questions
    Contracts—American Mail Service, 1045
    Insurance of Parcels, 821
    Mails to the Western Islands, 837
    Postal Delays, 1730
    Post Office Clerks, 820
    Pre-payment of Postage, 56
    Registration of Telegraphic Addresses, 1459
    Scotland—Telegraph Office Clerks, 1277
    Sixpenny Telegrams, 845
    Superintendents of Sorting Offices, 1274

[*cont.*

MANNERS, Right Hon. Lord J. J. R.—*cont.*
  Post Office (Ireland)—Questions
    Contracts—Irish Mails, 1273
    Dublin Sorting Office, 247
    Rural Letter Carrier, Co. Cavan, 1267
    Sorters in Irish Mail Trains, 332
    Sunday Mail to Achill Island, 832
    Tampering with Letters, 1041
  Supply—Post Office Packet Service, 181, 182
    Post Office Services, &c. 180
    Report, Res. 3, 548
  Telegraph Acts Amendment, 680; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 557, 577

MARJORIBANKS, Hon. E., *Berwickshire*
  Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. 209; Comm. 983; *cl.* 4, 1175, 1176; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1182; *cl.* 7, 1186; Amendt. 1187, 1189
  Secretary for Scotland, Comm. 978; *cl.* 5, 1152, 1157; *cl.* 6, 1160
  Supply (Supplementary Estimates)—Peterhead Harbour, 188

MARLBOROUGH, Duke of
  Asia (Central)—Russia and Afghanistan—Delimitation of the Frontier, 1028
  Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Comm. 1256, 1258; Report, *add. cl.* 1433; Commons Reasons Consid. 1714

Marriage Law—Attendance of Registrars
  Question, Mr. Atkinson; Answer, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) *Aug* 4, 1039

MARUM, Mr. E. P. M., *Kilkenny Co.*
  Ireland—Education—Model School, Kilkenny, 841
    Roads and Bridges—Tour Slate Quarries—Bridge over the River Suir, 55
  Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24, Res. 261
  Supply—Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, 414, 419
    Disturnpiked and Main Roads in England and Wales, 380
    Prisons, Ireland, 373
    Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 342

Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Bill
  Questions, Observations, Earl Granville; short debate thereon *July* 27, 27; *July* 28, 214
  The Supplementary Lists, Question, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 6, 1284

Medical Relief Disqualification Removal Bill
l. Read 1ª (*E. of Milltown*) *July* 27, 2; Notice, The Earl of Milltown; short debate thereon
  Read 2ª, after debate *July* 28, 217 (No. 207)
  Committee; Report *July* 30, 498
  Read 3ª *July* 31, 659
  Royal Assent *Aug* 6 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 46]

MELDON, Mr. C. H., *Kildare*
  Supply—Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, 400, 401, 402, 444
    Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 345

Mercantile Marine — Pilots — Test of Colour-Blindness
  Question, Mr. J. G. Talbot; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 10, 1572

METROPOLIS (*Miscellaneous Questions*)
  Corporate Bodies—The City Fellowship of Porters, Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *July* 30, 506
  Local Government outside the City Area, Question, Mr. Firth; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 11, 1732
  Tramway Companies—Employés' Hours of Labour, Question, Mr. Samuel Smith; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 4, 1046

 Public Health
  Contamination of the River Lea, Question, Mr. John Holms; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 4, 1064; Question, Mr. Daniel Grant; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 7, 1456
  The River Thames—Purification of Sewage, Questions, Mr. Borlase; Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 6, 1282; *Aug* 10, 1573;—*Canvey Island,* Question, Mr. Clare Read; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 10, 1576
    [See title *Public Health*]

 Street Traffic
  Obstruction in the Streets, Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 11, 1728

 The Parks
  The Regent's Park—Re-enclosure of Land, Questions, Mr. Daniel Grant; Answers, The First Commissioner of Works (Mr. Plunket) *Aug* 4, 1049; *Aug* 7, 1458

Metropolis Management Acts Amendment Bill (*Earl of Camperdown*)
l. Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 33]

Metropolitan Board of Works (Further Powers) Bill (*Sir James M'Garel-Hogg, Baron Henry De Worms, Mr. Bryce*)
c. Bill withdrawn * *July* 31 [Bill 44]

Metropolitan Board of Works (Money) Bill
l. Read 1ª * (*E. of Iddesleigh*) *July* 27 (No. 209)
Read 2ª * *July* 30
Committee *; Report *July* 31
Read 3ª * *Aug* 3
Royal Assent *Aug* 6 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 50]

Metropolitan Police Staff Superannuation Bill (*Mr. Stuart-Wortley, Sir Henry Holland*)
c. Read 2° * *July* 27 [Bill 246]
Committee *; Report; read 3° *July* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*E. Beauchamp*) *July* 30 (No. 222)
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived *Aug* 7
Read 3ª * *Aug* 10

Metropolitan Police, The
Question, Mr. Cavendish Bentinck; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *July* 27, 62

Metropolitan Water Companies
Question, General Sir George Balfour; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 11, 1738

Milltown, Earl of
Criminal Law Amendment, Commons Amendts. Consid. 1553
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. 1265; Report, *cl.* 16, 1548
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Comm. 1259
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 1R. 2, 3, 4, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 34, 214, 215; 2R. 217, 229, 234; Comm. 499, 500; 3R. 659
Telegraph Acts Amendment, 2R. 1027
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, 1528, 1530, 1531

Milner, Sir F. G., *York City*
Africa (South) — Boers — Attack on Mr. J. Donaldson, 1282
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. 589

Molloy, Mr. B. C., *King's Co.*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1243
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 12, 804, 805, 806; *add. cl.* 892
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 8, 996; *cl.* 12, 1000, 1003
Land Purchase (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* 1843, 1848
Supply—Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, 441, 442, 447
Prisons, Ireland, 379

Monckton, Mr. F., *Staffordshire, W.*
Housing of the Working Classes (England), 2R. 1606; Comm. *add. cl.* 1838

Monk, Mr. C. J., *Gloucester City*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 730
Suez Canal—The Paris Conference, 1460

Monson, Lord
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 31

Morley, Mr. S., *Bristol*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 721; *add. cl.* 881

Morocco—Suppression of Journals
Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. M'Coan; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *July* 31, 669

Mount-Temple, Lord
Criminal Law Amendment, Commons Amendts. Consid. 1554
Parliament—Palace of Westminster—House of Lords — Frescoes in the Peers' Robing Room, 13
River Thames (No. 2), Comm. 235; Report, *cl.* 6, Amendt. 814; 3R. 1262, 1525
Smoke Nuisance Abatement, 2R. 481
Telegraph Acts Amendment, 2R. 1026, 1027

Moveable Dwellings Bill (*Mr. Digby, Mr. Elton, Mr. Burt, Mr. Warton, Mr. Broadhurst*)
c. Read 2°, after debate *Aug* 10, 1705 [Bill 239]
Bill withdrawn * *Aug* 12

Mundella, Right Hon. A. J., *Sheffield*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* 857, 858
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. 960

Muntz, Mr. P. A., *Warwickshire, N.*
Law and Police—"Pall Mall Gazette"—Publication of Offensive Articles, 51

Napier of Magdala, Lord
Defences of the Empire — Armaments and Munitions of War, 1724

National Debt Bill (*Earl of Iddesleigh*)
l. Committee *; Report *July* 27
Read 3ª * *July* 28
Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 43]

Navy (*Miscellaneous Questions*)
Accountant General of the Navy, Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 4, 1052
Constitution of the Admiralty—A Permanent Finance Lord, Question, Mr. Beresford; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *July* 28, 243; Questions, Sir John Hay, Mr. Gray; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 4, 1051
Finance and Expenditure — The Vote of Credit — Report of the Committee of Investigation, Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 11, 1729

[*cont.*

NAVY—*cont.*
Dockyard Expenditure, Questions, Mr. Puleston, Sir H. Drummond Wolff; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *July* 30, 515; Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *July* 31, 671
H.M.S. "Cruiser," Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, The Secretary to the Admiralty (Mr. Ritchie) *July* 30, 514
Naval Courts Martial—Collision between the "Hecla" and the "Cheerful," Question, Mr. Giles; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 11, 1733
The Evolutionary Squadron, Question, Mr. Gourley; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 6, 1270; Question, Sir John Hay; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *Aug* 11, 1731
H.M.S. "Ajax," Questions, Mr. Beresford, Sir John Hay; Answers, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *July* 28, 243
Torpedo Crews, Question, Mr. Puleston; Answer, The Civil Lord of the Admiralty (Mr. Ashmead-Bartlett) *July* 30, 515
The Navy List — Warrant Officers, Question, Captain Price; Answer, The First Lord of the Admiralty (Lord George Hamilton) *July* 30, 509

Navy and Army Expenditure, 1883-4
Committee to consider the Savings and Deficiencies upon the Grants for Navy and Army Services in the year ended on the 31st day of March 1884, and the temporary sanction obtained from the Treasury by the Navy and Army Departments to Expenditure not provided for in the Grants for that year, To-morrow *July* 27
Ordered, That the Appropriation Accounts for the Navy and Army Departments, which were presented upon the 23rd day of February last, be referred to the Committee
Resolutions considered in Committee and agreed to *July* 29, 468
Resolutions reported *July* 30

NEWDEGATE, Mr. C. N., *Warwickshire, N.*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1245
Parliament—Business of the House, 843
Supply—Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 353, 360
Trade and Navigation Accounts—Importation of Cattle, &c. from Ireland, 1050

New Guinea, High Commissioner of
Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 27, 66
[See title *Western Pacific*]

NEWPORT, Viscount, *Shropshire, N.*
Cyprus (Finance, &c.)—Landing Duties, 63

NOLAN, Colonel J. P., *Galway Co.*
Army Estimates—Warlike Stores, 138
Widows' Pensions, &c. 171, 172

[*cont.*

NOLAN, Colonel J. P.—*cont.*
Cattle Importation — Canadian and American Cattle, 1737
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1249
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Pleuro-Pneumonia in Ireland, 1059
Educational Endowments (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1905
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 4, 992; *cl.* 14, 1006; Lords Amendts. Consid. 1891
Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1080, 1082; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1660; *cl.* 8, 1682; *add. cl.* 1701, 1702; Consid. *add. cl.* 1840
Parliament—Business of the House, 1454
Post Office—Postal Delays, 1730
Supply—Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, 435, 439, 440
Disturnpiked and Main Roads in England and Wales, 381
Peterhead Harbour, 185, 186, 187
Post Office Packet Service, 182
Prisons, Ireland, Motion for reporting Progress, 377, 378
Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 356
Report, Res. 1, 528; Res. 3, 548
Ways and Means—Inland Revenue—Grocers' Licences (Ireland), 836

NORTHCOTE, Hon. H. S. (Financial Secretary, War Department), *Exeter*
Army—Clothing Department—Military Temporary Clerks, 1457
Military Expedition to the Soudan — Widows of Soldiers, 1733
Army Estimates—Military Education, 152
Retired Allowances to Officers of Militia, &c. Forces, 176
War Office, 169

NORWOOD, Mr. C. M., *Kingston-upon-Hull*
Railways (England and Wales) — Terminal Charges, 1049

O'BRIEN, Sir P., *King's Co.*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1236, 1247, 1249
Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24, Res. 279
Supply — Disturnpiked and Main Roads in England and Wales, 381

O'BRIEN, Mr. W., *Mallow*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1228
Ireland—Questions
Coastguard—Divisional Officer at Dundalk, 526
Commissioners of National Education—Erection of New Schools — Building Materials, 1570
Fishery Piers and Harbours—Greystones Harbour, 1722
Law and Police—Illegal Fishing in Kildare—Insanitary Houses at Kill, 1048
Post Office—Sorters in Irish Mail Trains, 832
Public Works—Deductions from Road Contractors' Accounts — Mr. F. Morris, Secretary to Grand Jury, Co. Clare, 1047

[*cont.*

O'Brien, Mr. W.—*cont.*
Relief of Distress Act, 1880—Loans—Co. Donegal, 830, 831
Royal Irish Constabulary—Pensioners, 50
Ireland—Registration of Voters Act—Questions
Assistant Revising Barristers, 1457, 1730
List of Voters—Derry, 842
Printing of the Voting Lists, Co. Armagh, 59;—Supplemental Lists, 827, 828
Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24, Res. 288, 298
Supply—Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 348

O'Connor, Mr. A., *Queen's Co.*
Army—Line Battalions on Foreign Service—The Royal Irish and the East Surrey, 839
Army Estimates—Provisions, Forage, &c. 108
Warlike Stores, 122, 142
Egypt (Soudan)—Garrison of Kassala, 64
Evidence by Commission, Comm. 207
Ireland—Magistracy—Mr. Hans White, J.P., 1871, 1872
Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 8, 1682
Parliament—Business of the House, 680
Prince Henry of Battenberg's Naturalization, Comm. 682
Southwark and Vauxhall Water, 2R. 45
Supply (Supplementary Estimates)—Civil Contingencies Fund, &c. 190
Peterhead Harbour, 188

O'Connor, Mr. T. P., *Galway*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1240, 1241
County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (Pensions), Comm. *add. cl.* 1515
Egypt (Soudan)—Suakin-Berber Railway, 833
Ireland — Poor Law — Galway and Arran Island Dispensaries, 519
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 4, 989; *cl.* 8, 994; *cl.* 12, 997, 998, 1002; *cl.* 15, Amendt. 1008; *cl.* 18, 1012; *add. cl.* 1017, 1023, 1024
Papal See—Diplomatic Communication with the Vatican—Sir George Errington, 685, 686
Parliament—Business of the House, 847, 849
Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24, Res. 254, 275, 286
Supply—Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, 428
Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 339
Report, Res. 1, 529, 531

O'Gorman Mahon, The, *Clare*
Ireland—Inland Navigation and Drainage—Kilkee Drainage, 1043, 1455

O'Kelly, Mr. J., *Roscommon*
Army Estimates—Warlike Stores, 124
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 15, 1007
Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24, Res. 300
Supply—Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 346
Supply (Supplementary Estimates)—Peterhead Harbour, 189

Onslow, Mr. D. R., *Guildford*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, 629; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 778; *add. cl.* 917; Consid. *add. cl.* 1406, 1413, 1415, 1425
East India Army Pensions Deficiency, 2R. 811
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1804; *cl.* 13, 1828
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Annual Financial Statement, Comm. 1370
Infants, 2R. Motion for Adjournment, 1025; Comm. 1856

Ordnance—Surveyor General (*see* Dawnay, Hon. G. C.)

O'Shea, Mr. W. H., *Clare*
County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (Pensions), Comm. *add. cl.* 1517
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 18, 1011
Land Purchase (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* 1841, 1846

Otway, Sir A. J. (Chairman of Committees of Ways and Means and Deputy Speaker), *Rochester*
Army Estimates—Provisions, Forage, &c. 78, 80, 81
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 603, 604, 606, 615, 616; *cl.* 3, 629, 696; *cl.* 4, 718, 751, 763, 765, 766; *cl.* 5, 768, 769, 775, 777, 782, 783; *cl.* 6, 791, 792; *cl.* 12, 805, 807; *add. cl.* 864, 882, 888, 895, 903, 904, 911
Edinburgh Extension and Sewerage, Consid. 41, 43
Educational Endowments (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 4, 1897
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1798, 1799, 1801, 1804; *cl.* 13, 1827; *cl.* 14, 1835
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Annual Financial Statement, Comm. 1378, 1379
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 2, 984; *cl.* 16, 1009; *cl.* 18, 1014; *add. cl.* 1015, 1018, 1022; Consid. *add. cl.* 1194
Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, 1657, 1661; *cl.* 7, 1679; *cl.* 9, 1686; *cl.* 17, 1693; *add. cl.* 1698, 1699, 1701
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Lords Amendts. Consid. *cl.* B, 1563
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), Comm. *add. cl.* 203, 207
Public Works Loans, Comm. *add. cl.* 981, 982, 983
Ramsden Estate, 3R. 1034, 1036, 1198
Rathmines and Rathgar Township, Lords Amendts. to Commons Amendts. Consid. 385
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. *cl.* 5, 1149; *cl.* 6, 1166, 1167, 1170; Schedule, 1173
Sunderland Corporation, Lords Amendts. Consid. 1033
Supply—Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, 400, 401, 402, 438, 453
Post Office Packet Service, 181
Prisons, Ireland, 380

PAGET, Mr. R. H., *Somersetshire, Mid.*
Commissioners of Customs—A Report, 828
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Swine—The Orders in Council, 523
Supply—Prisons, Ireland, 379

Papal See, The—Diplomatic Communication with the Vatican—Sir George Errington
Questions, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *July* 31, 685; Observations, Mr. O'Brien; short debate thereon *Aug* 5, 1228

PARKER, Mr. C. S., *Perth*
Edinburgh Extension and Sewerage, Consid. 42
Parliament—Business of the House, 1583
Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1509, 1510
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. *cl.* 5, 1157, 1158

Parliament

LORDS—

Private Bills, Standing Orders Nos. 10., 22., 52., 57., 64., 85., 114., 115., 134., and 179., considered and amended; and to be printed as amended (No. 227) *Aug* 3

Palace of Westminster—House of Lords—The Frescoes in the Peers' Robing Room, Question, Observations, Lord Lamington; Reply, Lord Henniker; short debate thereon *July* 27, 13

COMMONS—

THE NEW RULES OF PROCEDURE

Rule 2 (Adjournment of the House)

The Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry—Constitution of the Commission

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Mr. Broadhurst*) *Aug* 11, 1745; whereupon a number of Members—less than 40—rising in their places, the hon. Member could not proceed with his Motion

SITTINGS AND ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE

Moved, "That this House do now adjourn" (*Sir Henry Holland*) *July* 29, 475; after short debate, it being Six of the clock the House stood adjourned till To-morrow

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

The Prorogation

Moved, "That the Standing Orders relating to Wednesday Sittings be suspended To-morrow" (*Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer*) *Aug* 11, 1742; after short debate, Motion agreed to

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE AND PUBLIC BUSINESS

Questions, Sir Edward Colebrooke, Mr. Lewis; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 27, 66; Question, Sir George Campbell; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 30, 527; Questions, Mr Arthur O'Connor, Mr. Labouchere; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 31, 680; Questions, Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Serjeant Simon, Mr. Newdegate; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 3, 843; Questions, The Marquess of Hartington, Mr. A. R. D. Elliot; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 4, 1062; Question, Mr. West; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1064; Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. A. R. D. Elliot; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 6, 1285;—*Ministerial Statement,* Questions, The Marquess of Hartington, General Sir George Balfour, Sir John Hay, Colonel Colthurst, Mr. James Stuart; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 10, 1582;—*Land Purchase (Ireland) Bill,* Question, Mr. Findlater; Answer, The Chief Secretary for Ireland (Sir W. Hart Dyke) *July* 27, 57; Questions, Mr. Brodrick, Mr. Serjeant Simon; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 6, 1284; Questions, Mr. Brodrick, Colonel Nolan, Mr. Sexton; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 7, 1454;—*Universities (Scotland) Bill,* Question, Mr. Webster; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross), The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 28, 242;—*Criminal Law Amendment Bill,* Question, Captain Price; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer; Observations, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 30, 525;—*Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill,* Questions, Mr. James Stuart, Mr. Labouchere, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 3, 847;—*Police Enfranchisement Bill,* Question, Mr. Coleridge Kennard; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 3, 848;—*Labourers (Ireland) Bill,* Questions, Mr. Gray, Mr. Sexton, Mr. T. P. O'Connor; Answers, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 3, 848;—*Secretary for Scotland Bill,* Question, Sir Lyon Playfair; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 3, 849

PARLIAMENT—COMMONS—*Business of the House and Public Business*—cont.

House of Commons—Officers of this House—The Serjeant and Deputy Serjeant, Question, Sir Robert Fowler; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 28, 245

Parliament — Privilege — Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24
Moved, "That the expressions in the Speech of the Right honourable John Bright, delivered in the Westminster Palace Hotel on Friday night, the 24th of July, as reported in *The Daily News* of Saturday, the 25th of

Parliament — Privilege — Speech of Mr. John Bright, July 24—cont.
July, charging that certain Members 'who profess to be representatives of Ireland, and who sit in that character in the House of Commons, are disloyal to the Crown,' and that 'they have exhibited a boundless sympathy for criminals and murderers,' are a Breach of the Privileges of the House " (*Mr. Callan*) *July* 28, 250 ; after debate, Question put ; A. 23, N. 154 ; M. 131 ; Div. List, A & N, 305

PARLIAMENT—HOUSE OF LORDS
New Peers
July 27—Alexander William George Earl Fife in that part of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland called Ireland, K.T., created Earl of Fife
The Right Honourable Sir William Baliol Brett, Knight, Master of the Rolls, created Baron Esher of Esher in the county of Surrey
July 28—Sir Robert James Loyd-Lindsay, K.C.B., V.C., created Baron Wantage of Lockinge in the county of Berks

Took the Oath for the First Time
July 30—The Lord Bishop of Truro

Sat First
July 31—The Lord Kenyon, after the death of his grandfather

Parliamentary Elections
Eye Election, Questions, Mr. Labouchere, Sir Henry James ; Answers, The Attorney General (Sir Richard Webster) *July* 30, 527
Use of National Elementary School Rooms, Question, Mr. Jesse Collings ; Answer, The Vice President of the Council (Mr. E. Stanhope) *Aug* 4, 1044
[See title *Registration of Voters*]

Parliamentary Elections (Corrupt Practices) Bill (*Earl Beauchamp*)
l. Committee * *July* 28 (No. 219)
Report * *July* 30
Read 3ª * *July* 31
Royal Assent *Aug* 6 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 56]

Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers) Bill
(*Mr. Attorney General, Sir Charles Dilke*)
c. Committee ; Report *July* 27, 196 [Bill 99]
Considered *July* 30, 631 [Bill 251]
Read 3º * *July* 31
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord Chancellor*) *Aug* 3 (No. 231)
Read 2ª * *Aug* 4
Committee * ; Report *Aug* 6
Read 3ª * *Aug* 7

PARNELL, Mr. C. S., *Cork City*
Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1103

Patent Law Amendment Bill
(*Sir Farrer Herschell, Mr. Holms*)
c. Committee—R.P. *July* 27, 210 [Bill 240]
Committee * ; Report ; read 3º *July* 28
l. Read 1ª * (*Lord FitzGerald*) *July* 30 (No. 223)
Read 2ª * *July* 31
Committee * ; Report ; read 3ª *Aug* 3

PATRICK, Mr. R. W. COCHRAN-, *Ayrshire, N.*
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. 944

PEASE, Mr. A., *Whitby*
Supply (Supplementary Estimates)—Peterhead Harbour, 188

PEEL, Right Hon. A. W. (*see* SPEAKER, The)

PELL, Mr. A., *Leicestershire, S.*
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. 1754 ; *cl.* 1, Amendt. 1763, 1766, 1768 ; *cl.* 3, 1780, 1817

PERCY, Lord A. M. A., *Westminster*
Education Department—London Board Schools —Annual Cost per Scholar, 1037

Peru and Chili — The Peruvian Bondholders
Questions, Mr. Williamson, Mr. Labouchere ; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *Aug* 4, 1056 ; Questions, Mr. Williamson, Sir Henry Tyler ; Answers, Mr. Speaker, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *Aug* 7, 1446

PICTON, Mr. J. A., *Leicester Bo.*
Church of England — Excommunication at Saham Toney, 1276
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 609 ; *cl.* 4, 742, 762 ; Amendt. 763, 765, 766 ; *add. cl.* 904, 906 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1396 ; *cl.* 5, 1483 ; *cl.* 9, 1487
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1773, 1802 ; Consid. *cl.* 3, 1889
Law and Justice—Jeffries' Case—Mr. Edlin, Q.C., Assistant Judge, 672
Parliamentary Voters—Registration of Voters in Agricultural Districts, 1568
Science and Art—Examinations in Drawing—Failures to Pass, 678

PLAYFAIR, Right Hon. Sir Lyon, *Edinburgh and St. Andrew's Universities*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* 880, 881
Parliament—Business of the House, 849
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. 922, 977 ; *cl.* 2, 980 ; *cl.* 5, 1137, 1141 ; *cl.* 6, 1162, 1166, 1168, 1169

PLUNKET, Right Hon. D. R. (First Commissioner of Works), *Dublin University*
General Gordon—Design for a Statue, 837
Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1093; Comm. 1632; *cl.* 2, 1649; Consid. *add. cl.* 1843
Parks (Metropolis)—Regent's Park—Re-enclosure of Land, 1049, 1459
Supply, Report, Res. 4, 548, 553, 554
Supplementary Estimates — Marlborough House, 184

Pluralities Bill (*Mr. Acland, Mr. Edward Howard, Sir John Kennaway, Lord Edward Cavendish*)
c. Considered *; read 3° *July* 27 [Bill 241]
l. Read 1ª * (*The Lord Bishop of London*) *July* 28 (No. 213)
Read 2ª *July* 30, 493
Committee *; Report *Aug* 3
Read 3ª * *Aug* 4
Royal Assent *Aug* 6 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 54]

Polehampton Estates Bill (*Earl of Iddesleigh*)
l. Committee *; Report *July* 27 (No. 183)
Read 3ª * *July* 28
Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 40]

Police Enfranchisement Extension Bill (*Mr. Coleridge Kennard, Sir Henry Selwin-Ibbetson, Sir Henry Drummond Wolff, Mr. Cowen, Lord Claud John Hamilton, Mr. Robert Fowler, Mr. Reid, Mr. Houldsworth, Mr. George Elliot*)
c. Question, Mr. Coleridge Kennard; Answer, Mr. Bryce *July* 31, 674
Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Aug* 5, 1251
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Morgan Lloyd*); it being a quarter of an hour before Six of the clock, the Debate stood adjourned
Adjourned Debate resumed *Aug* 7, 1523
Moved, "That the Debate be further adjourned till Monday next;" after short debate, Motion agreed to
Bill withdrawn * *Aug* 12 [Bill 219]

POOR LAW (ENGLAND AND WALES)
Conway Union—Mr. Davies, Medical Officer, Question, Mr. Thorold Rogers; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *July* 28, 246
Hungerford Board of Guardians—Appointment of Master and Matron for the Workhouse, Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 4, 1061

Poor Law Guardians (*Ireland*) [*Cost of Prosecutions*]
Res. considered in Committee, and agreed to *July* 28, 333
Res. reported *July* 29

Poor Law Guardians (*Ireland*) *Bill*
Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 7, 1454
Lords' Amendments, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Attorney General for Ireland (Mr. Holmes) *Aug* 4, 1063

Poor Law Guardians (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. John Redmond, Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Gray, Mr. Barry*)
c. Consideration of Lords' Amendments deferred till Friday the 21st of August *Aug* 7, 1524

Poor Law Unions' Officers (Ireland) Bill (*Sir William Hart Dyke, Mr. Attorney General for Ireland*)
c. Read 3° * *July* 27 [Bill 214]
l. Read 1ª * (*M. of Waterford*) *July* 28 (No. 214)
Read 2ª *July* 30, 494
Committee *; Report *July* 31
Read 3ª *Aug* 6, 1260
c. Lords' Amendt. considered, and, after short debate, amended, and agreed to *Aug* 12, 1913

POSTMASTER GENERAL (*see* MANNERS Right Hon. Lord J. J. R.)

POST OFFICE (*Miscellaneous Questions*)
Clerks, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 3, 819

Contracts—The American Mail Service, Question, Mr. Giles; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 4, 1045
The Irish Mails, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 6, 1272

Insurance of Parcels, Question, Sir Robert Fowler; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 3, 821
Mails to the Western Islands, Question, Lord Colin Campbell; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 3, 837; Question, Lord Colin Campbell; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *Aug* 6, 1269
Postal Delays, Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 11, 1730
Pre-payment of Postage, Question, Sir John Kennaway; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *July* 27, 56
Registration of Telegraphic Addresses, Question, Colonel King-Harman; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 7, 1459
Sixpenny Telegrams, Question, Mr. Alderman Lawrence; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 3, 845
Superintendents of Sorting Offices, Question, Mr. Sexton; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 6, 1274

Post Office Sites Bill
(*Earl of Iddesleigh*)
l. Report * *July* 27 (No. 181)
Committee *; Report *July* 28
Read 3ª * *July* 30
Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 45]

POWER, Mr. P. J., *Waterford Co.*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1235
Ireland — Law and Police—Waterford Free Force, 826
Registration of Voters—Revision Sessions—Kilmacthomas Union, 826
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 8, 994, 1000; Consid. *cl.* 17, Amendt. 1193
Land Purchase (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* 1847
Supply—Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 335
Supply — Supplementary Estimates — Peterhead Harbour, 189

POWER, Mr. R., *Waterford City*
Ireland—Fishery Laws—River Suir—Case of —— O'Shea and others, 53

POWIS, Earl of
Prosecution of Offences Act, 1879, 656

Prevention of Crimes Amendment Bill [H.L.] (*Mr. Tomlinson*)
c. Order for Committee read; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *July* 27, 210
Moved, "That the Debate be now adjourned" (*Mr. Hopwood*); after short debate, Question put, and agreed to; Debate adjourned
Debate resumed *Aug* 11, 1857; Committee; Report; Considered; read 3° [Bill 93]

PRICE, Captain G. E., *Devonport*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 603, 614, 617, 621; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 696, 705, 708; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 716, 718, 732, 750; *cl.* 5, 776; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 785; *cl.* 12, 806; *add. cl.* 898
Defences of the Empire—Defence of the Seaports, 59
Navy List—Warrant Officers, 509
Parliament—Business of the House, 525

PRIME MINISTER (*see* SALISBURY, Marquess of)

Prince Henry of Battenberg's Naturalization Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Chancellor*)
l. Certificate read; petitioner took the Oath *July* 31, 632
The Queen's consent signified by the Lord Chancellor; Bill read 2ª; Report; read 3ª
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 1°" (*Mr. Stuart-Wortley, Under Secretary of State for the Home Department*) *July* 31, 681; Motion agreed to; Bill read 1°
Moved, "That the Standing Orders relating to Naturalization Bills be suspended, and that the Bill be read 2°;" Motion agreed to; Standing Orders suspended; Bill read 2°

Prince Henry of Battenberg's Naturalization Bill—cont.
Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair;" after short debate, Motion agreed to; Committee; Report; read 3°

Prosecution of Offences Act, 1879
Observations, The Earl of Powis; Reply, The Lord Chancellor (Lord Halsbury) *July* 31, 656

Public Health
The Cholera, Question, Sir Walter B. Barttelot; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour); Question, Mr. Brodrick [no reply] *Aug* 6, 1282
The Cholera in Spain, Question, Mr. Labouchere; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *July* 30, 521
[See title *Metropolis*]

Public Health (Members and Officers) Bill (*Earl Brownlow*)
l. Committee * *July* 27 (No. 194)
Report * *July* 28
Read 3ª * *July* 30
Royal Assent *Aug* 6 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 53]

Public Health (Metropolis) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Marquess of Salisbury*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Aug* 7 (No. 240)

Public Health (Scotland) Provisional Order Bill (*Earl Beauchamp*)
l. Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. cxxvii]

Public Health (Scotland) Provisional Order (No. 2) Bill (*Earl Beauchamp*)
l. Read 2ª * *July* 30 (No. 188)
Committee *; Report *July* 31
Read 3ª * *Aug* 3
Royal Assent *Aug* 6 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. clii]

Public Health (Ships, &c.) Bill
(*Earl Brownlow*)
l. Read 3ª * *July* 27 (No. 186)
Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 35]

Public Offices Site Act, 1882
Question, Observations, Lord Stratheden and Campbell; Reply, The First Lord of the Treasury (The Earl of Iddesleigh) *Aug* 11, 1716

Public Offices, The New — Designs for the New War Office and Admiralty
Question, The Earl of Wemyss; Answer, The First Lord of the Treasury (The Earl of Iddesleigh) *Aug* 4, 1032

[*cont.*

Public Works Loans Bill
(*Sir Henry Holland, Mr. Dalrymple*)
c. Resolutions in Committee *July* 28, 383
Resolutions reported, and agreed to; Bill ordered
Instruction to the gentlemen appointed to bring in the Bill, That they do make provision therein for the appointment of Public Works Loans Commissioners
Read 1° * *July* 29 [Bill 254]
Read 2° * *July* 31
Committee; Report *Aug* 3, 981
Read 3° * *Aug* 4
l. Read 1ª * (*E. of Iddesleigh*) *Aug* 5 (No. 234)
Read 2ª * *Aug* 6
Committee*; Report *Aug* 7
Read 3ª * *Aug* 10

Public Works — The Mail Jetty at Holyhead
Question, Mr. Morgan Lloyd; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *July* 27, 60

Puleston, Mr. J. H., *Devonport*
Army Estimates — Miscellaneous Effective Services, 154, 163, 166
Civil Service — Lower Division Clerks and Writers, 1733, 1734
Education Department—The London School Board, 1729
Metropolis — Street Traffic—Obstruction in the Streets, 1728
Navy—Dockyard Expenditure, 515
Evolutionary Squadron—Torpedo Crews, 515
Telegraph Acts Amendment, 680

Raikes, Right Hon. H. C., *Cambridge University*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *add. cl.* 859, 886, 893, 895

Railways (England and Wales)—Terminal Charges
Question, Mr. Norwood; Answer, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 4, 1049

Ramsay, Mr. J., *Falkirk, &c.*
Parliament—Adjournment, 473
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. 940, 952; *cl.* 5, 1141; *cl.* 6, 1163, 1166, 1168

Ramsden Estate Bill [Lords] (by Order)
c. Order for 3R. read *Aug* 4, 1034; Moved, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect to Clause 5" (*Mr. Arthur Arnold*); after short debate, Ordered, That the Bill be read 3° To-morrow
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3°" (*Sir Charles Forster*) *Aug* 5, 1197
Amendt. to leave out "now read 3°," add "re-committed in respect of Clause 5" (*Mr. Arthur Arnold*) *v*; Question proposed, "That 'now read 3°,' &c.;" after short debate, Question put; A. 48, N. 25; M. 23 (D. L. 272); Bill read 3°

Rathbone, Mr. W., *Carnarvonshire*
Supply, Report, Res. 2, 541
South Africa and St. Helena, 461

Rathmines and Rathgar Township Bill [Lords] (by Order)
c. Lords Amendt. to Commons Amendts. considered, and, after short debate, agreed to *July* 29, 385

Read, Mr. C. S., *Norfolk, W.*
Contagious Diseases (Animals) Acts—Pleuro-Pneumonia—Ireland, 818
Order in Council—Swine, 248
Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1108
Lotteries Act—Foreign Lotteries, 1453
Public Health (Metropolis) — Purification of the Thames (Canvey Island), 1576
Registration (Supplementary) Lists, 1581

Recent Legislation—The Socialistic Tendency
Observations, The Earl of Wemyss; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury; short debate thereon *July* 31, 632

Recreation Grounds—Woodcote Green, Bromsgrove
Questions, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 11, 1739

Redesdale, Earl of (Chairman of Committees)
Earldom of Mar Restitution, Comm. 494, 498
Expiring Laws Continuance, Comm. 1196
Parliament—Palace of Westminster—House of Lords—Frescoes in the Peers' Robing Room, 13

Registration Appeals (Ireland) Bill [H.L.]
(*The Earl Beauchamp*)
l. Presented; read 1ª * *Aug* 3 (No. 226)
Read 2ª *; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Aug* 4
c. Read 1° * *Aug* 4 [Bill 259]
Read 2° * *Aug* 5
Committee; Report; read 3° *Aug* 7, 1522

Registration of Voters
Alleged Misconduct of Overseers, Question, Mr. Thorold Rogers; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *July* 28, 246
Registration of Voters in Agricultural Districts, Questions, Mr. Picton, Mr. Jesse Collings; Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour), The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 10, 1568
Return of Occupiers (England and Wales), Question, Mr. Woodall; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for the Home Department (Mr. Stuart-Wortley) *Aug* 4, 1051

[*cont.*

Registration of Voters—cont.
Supplementary Lists, Questions, Mr. Jesse Collings, Mr. Clare Read; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross), The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 10, 1581
List of Voters—Willesden, Question, Mr. George Russell; Answer, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 11, 1731

Reid, Mr. R. T., *Hereford*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, 704, 714; *add. cl.* 876, 884

Representation of the People Act, 1884
Police Enfranchisement, Question, Mr. Coleridge Kennard; Answer, Mr. Speaker; Personal Explanation, Sir Henry James *Aug* 7, 1459
The Parliamentary Franchise (Scotland)—Crofters under £10 Rental, Question, Mr. D. J. Jenkins; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *July* 30, 505
The Electoral Acts — Distribution, Question, Sir Henry James; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *Aug* 11, 1741

Revising Barristers Bill (*Mr. Attorney General, Secretary Sir R. Assheton Cross*)
c. Committee*; Report *July* 29 [Bill 237]
Considered*; read 3º *July* 30
l. Read 1ª* (*Lord Chancellor*) *July* 31 (No. 225)
Read 2ª*; Committee negatived; read 3ª *Aug* 5
Royal Assent *Aug* 6 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 57]

Ritchie, Mr. C. T. (Secretary to the Admiralty), *Tower Hamlets*
Army—Commissariat Staff—Royal Marines, 1577
Navy—H.M.S. "Cruiser," 514

River Thames (No. 2) Bill (*The Lord Mount-Temple*)
l. Report* *July* 27 (No. 171)
Committee, after short debate *July* 28, 235
Report *Aug* 3, 813 (No. 218)
Moved, "That the Bill be now read 3ª" *Aug* 6, 1260; after short debate, Moved, "That the Debate be adjourned till Monday next" (*The Lord Chancellor*); Motion agreed to
Read 3ª *Aug* 10, 1525 (No. 238)
c. Lords Amendts. considered; amended, and agreed to *Aug* 11, 1858

Rogers, Mr. J. E. Thorold, *Southwark*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 603, 604; Amendt. 607, 610; Consid. *add. cl.* 1402, 1417; *cl.* 5, 1484; *cl.* 9, 1491; *cl.* 10, 1507
Indian Civil Service—Age of Candidates, 513
Parliamentary Elections—Registration of Voters—Alleged Misconduct of Volunteers, 246
Poor Law (England and Wales)—Conway Union—Mr. Davies, Medical Officer, 246

Rosebery, Earl of
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 1R. 4
Women's Suffrage, 2R. 217

Russell, Mr. G. W. E., *Aylesbury*
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *add. cl.* 1411
Registration of Voters (England)—List of Voters—Willesden, 1731

Rylands, Mr. P., *Burnley*
Army Estimates—Provisions, Forage, &c. 98, 100
Stationery Office—Contracts for Government Printing, 249

Salisbury, Marquess of (Prime Minister and Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs)
Asia (Central)—Russia and Afghanistan—Delimitation of the Frontier, 1029
Depression of Trade and Industry, Royal Commission on the—Constitution of the Commission, 1540, 1541
Egypt (Finance, &c.)—International Loan of £9,000,000, 213
Soudan—The Friendly Tribes, 1032
Egypt—Soudan Expeditions—Vote of Thanks to H.M. Military and Naval Forces, 1720; Res. 1859
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 34, 215; 2R. 224, 234; Comm, 501
Recent Legislation—Socialistic Tendency, 648, 650
River Thames (No. 2), 3R. 1261
Treaty of Berlin—Article X—Varna and Rustchuk Railway, 1434
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, 1530
Women's Suffrage, 2R. 217

Salt, Mr. T., *Stafford*
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), Comm. *add. cl.* 201

Sandhurst, Lord
Treaty of Berlin—Article X—Varna and Rustchuk Railway, 1434

School Boards Bill (*Lord President*)
l. Committee*; Report *July* 27 (No. 200)
Read 3ª* *July* 28
Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 38]

Sclater-Booth, Right Hon. G., *Hants, N.*
Army Estimates—Clothing Establishments, &c. 110

Scotland
Law and Police—Illegal Impounding of Children, Question, Mr. D. J. Jenkins; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *July* 30, 505
Post Office—Telegraph Office Clerks, Question, Mr. Biggar; Answer, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *Aug* 6, 1276
[*cont.*

Scotland—*cont.*
Public Health—Insanitary Condition of Duthil Churchyard, Question, Mr. Fraser-Mackintosh ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *July* 27, 46

Scottish and Irish Peerages Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Waveney*)
l. Bill withdrawn *Aug* 3, 812 (No. 10)

Scott, Mr. M. D., *Sussex, E.*
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 10, 1505

Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment Bill [H.L.]
c. Read 2°, after debate *July* 27, 208 [Bill 250]
Committee *—R.P. *July* 29
Committee deferred *Aug* 3, 983 ; short debate thereon
Committee ; Report *Aug* 4, 1173
Considered ; read 3°, after short debate *Aug* 7, 1509 [Bill 258]
l. Commons' Amendts. considered, and, after short debate, agreed to *Aug* 11, 1716

Secretary for Scotland Bill
Question, Sir George Campbell ; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *July* 28, 248 ; Question, Mr. Buchanan ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Sir R. Assheton Cross) *July* 30, 522

Secretary for Scotland Bill [H.L.]
(*Sir R. Assheton Cross*)
c. Order for Committee read ; Moved, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" *Aug* 3, 922
Amendt. to leave out from "That," add "in view of the Report of a Select Committee of last Session, recommending that there should be one responsible Minister of Education for Great Britain, it is not expedient, before this House has considered that Report, to proceed with the proposal of this Bill, that the charge of Scotch Education should be removed from the Vice President of the Council, thus lessening his influence and responsibility, in order to transfer it to the Secretary for Scotland intended to be created by this Bill" (*Sir Lyon Playfair*) *v.* ; Question proposed, "That the words, &c. ;" after debate, Amendt. withdrawn ; main Question put, and agreed to ; Committee—R.P. [Bill 242]
Committee : Report *Aug* 4, 1125
Considered * ; read 3° *Aug* 5

Secretary for Scotland [*Salaries*]
Res. considered in Committee, and agreed to *July* 28, 383
Order for Report thereupon read *July* 29, 473
Resolution re-committed ; considered in Committee ; Resolution agreed to
Resolution reported *July* 30

Selborne, Earl of
Copyhold Enfranchisement, 2R. 491
Earldom of Mar Restitution, Comm. 496
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 2R. 227

Sexton, Mr. T., *Sligo*
Army—Limerick Army Clothing Factory, 1458
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), Comm. 981
County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (Pensions), Comm., Motion for Adjournment, 382 ; *add. cl.* 1511, 1519, 1521, 1522
Depression of Trade and Industry — Royal Commission on, 513 ;—Names of the Commissioners, 824
Educational Endowments (Ireland), 2R. 1855 ; Comm. 1895 ; *cl.* 4, 1896, 1897, 1900 ; *cl.* 5, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1902 ; *cl.* 8, *ib.* ; *cl.* 12, 1903, 1904 ; *cl.* 17, 1906 ; *cl.* 22, 1907 ; *cl.* 24, *ib.* ; *cl.* 27, 1908 ; *cl.* 34, 1909 ; *cl.* 40, *ib.* ; *add. cl.* 1911 ; Preamble, Amendt. 1912
Education of the Blind, Royal Commission on —Constitution of the Commission, 1727
Housing of the Working Classes, 679
Ireland—Questions
  Board of National Education — Extra Instruction, 58
  Commissioners of National Education—National School Teachers—Case of Mr. Andrew Devitt, Porrelsborough, 1722
  Depression of Trade — A Royal Commission, 66, 67
  Education—Industrial School at Ballaghadarreen, Co. Mayo, 1451 ; — Education Office—The Inspection Staff, 1723
  Fisheries — The River Shannon — The Limerick Board of Conservators, 50
  Intermediate Education — Examinations, 58
  Irish Administration—Mr. E. G. Jenkinson, 1038
  Irish Industries — A Royal Commission, 677, 678
  Irish Land Commission — Appeal Court—Appeals from Tenants on Lord Rosse's Estate, Parsonstown, 1578 ;—Sub-Commissioners, 677
  Poor Law—Mr. Wiggins, Master of the Clones Union Workhouse, 1724
  Post Office—Contracts—Irish Mails, 1272 ; —Dublin Sorting Office, 247
  Royal Irish Constabulary—Extra Police at Gweedore, Co. Donegal, 47 ;—Protection Post at Bunduff, Co. Leitrim, 1038
  Science and Art Department, 1572
  Sligo Harbour Commissioners—Charges for Mooring—Loan for Improvements, 829
Ireland—Law and Justice—Questions
  Earl of Belfast, Clerk of the Peace, Co. Antrim, 53
  Mr. F. Falkiner, Q.C., Recorder of Dublin, 839
  Petty Sessions Clerk, Mullaghroe Petty Sessions District, Co. Sligo, 1037
Ireland—Law and Police—Questions
  Cork Co. Police, 667
  Detention of Intoxicated Persons, 1725, 1726

[*cont.*

SEXTON, Mr. T.—*cont.*
Fines for Dangerous use of Fireworks at Ballinrobe, 1571
Ireland—Registration of Voters (Ireland) Act—Questions
Clerk of the Peace, Co. Sligo, 1565
Co. Antrim, 837, 838, 1055
Publication of Lists, Co. Sligo, 1272
Revision Courts — Tyrone and Donegal, 1273
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 984, 985 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 989, 992 ; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 993, 994, 995, 996 ; *cl.* 12, *ib.* 997, 999 ; Amendt. 1000, 1001 ; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1003 ; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1004, 1005 ; *cl.* 15, 1006, 1007 ; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1008 ; *cl.* 18, Amendt. 1010, 1012, 1013 ; *add. cl.* 1014, 1015, 1019, 1021, 1022, 1023, 1024 ; Consid. *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1192 ; *cl.* 17, 1193 ; *add. cl.* 1194 ; Lords Amendts. Consid. 1890, 1891, 1892
Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1070 ; Comm. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1637, 1644, 1656, 1657, 1659, 1660, 1661, 1662 ; *cl.* 3, 1665, 1666 ; *cl.* 4, 1670, 1672 ; *cl.* 5, 1674, 1677 ; *cl.* 6, 1678 ; *cl.* 7, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 8, Amendt. 1680, 1681, 1682, 1684 ; *cl.* 13, Amendt. 1686, 1687 ; *cl.* 17, 1689, 1691, 1693 ; *cl.* 23, Amendt. 1694 ; *add. cl.* 1696, 1699, 1701, 1703 ; Schedule, 1704 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1841, 1845, 1846 ; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1850 ; *cl.* 7, Amendt. 1851 ; *cl.* 8, *ib.* ; *cl.* 9, 1852 ; *cl.* 15, Amendt. *ib.* ; *cl.* 16, 1853
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Lords Amendts. Consid. 1558 ; *cl.* A, *ib.*
Parliament—Adjournment, 475
Business of the House, 848, 849, 1455 ;—Prorogation, Ministerial Statement, 1744
Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24, Res. 289
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), Comm. *add. cl.* 196 ; Motion for reporting Progress, 203 ; Amendt. 205 ; Preamble, Amendt. 207
Poor Law Guardians, Lords' Amendments, 1063, 1454, 1524
Poor Law Unions' Officers (Ireland), Lords Amendts. Consid. 1913 ; Amendt. 1914
Post Office—Superintendents of Sorting Offices, 1274
Prevention of Crimes Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 1, 1857 ; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1858 ; *add. cl. ib*
Rathmines and Rathgar Township, Lords Amendts. to Commons Amendts. Consid. 385
Supply—Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, Amendt. 386, 400, 401, 423, 452, 453
Post Office Services, &c. 180
Prisons, Ireland, 370, 377, 378
Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 314
Report, Res. 1, 527 ; Res. 3, 545

Shannon Navigation Bill
(*Earl of Iddesleigh*)
l. Committee * ; Report *July* 27 (No. 184)
Read 3ª * *July* 28
Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 41]

SIMON, Mr. Serjeant J., *Dewsbury*
Army—Clothing Department—Military Temporary Clerks, 1457
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 597, 607 ; *cl.* 3, 693 ; Amendt. 694, 695, 707 ; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 717, 718, 761 ; *cl.* 5, 768 ; Amendt. 769, 779, 780, 782 ; *cl.* 6, 789 ; *add. cl.* 851 ; Amendt. 865, 867, 887, 888, 890, 903, 904, 911 ; Consid. *add. cl.* 1387 ; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1480 ; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1486
Parliament — Business of the House, 843, 1284, 1285

SINCLAIR, Mr. W. P., *Antrim*
Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. 1629 ; *cl.* 2, 1655 ; Schedule, 1704

Slave Traffic—Anglo-Egyptian Convention of 1877
Question, Sir Robert Fowler ; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *Aug* 10, 1570

SMITH, Right Hon. W. H. (Secretary of State for War), *Westminster*
Army—Questions
Alleged Unpopularity, 1577
Army Education—Staff College—Oriental Languages, 52
Army Medical Service, 821
Army Reserve, 1731
Auxiliary Forces—4th Royal Irish Fusiliers (Cavan Militia)—Major Lionel Brooke, 819, 1450 ;—Northampton Volunteers, 1278
Fatal Accident at Caterham Ranges, 56
Gunnery Experiments with Dynamite, 672
Line Battalions on Foreign Service—The Royal Irish and the 2nd East Surrey Regiment, 840 1275
Military Farms at Aldershot, 1578
Quartermasters and Riding Masters—Promotion, 1278
Railways in Time of War, 1456
Royal Military Academy, Woolwich—Meal Hours of Cadets, 833
Small Arm Ammunition — The Boxer Cartridge, 1041
Wire Gun Construction, 49
Army Estimates—Miscellaneous Effective Services, 165
Provisions, Forage, &c. 82, 83, 107
Superannuation Allowances, 174
Warlike Stores, 118, 122, 142, 146
Widows' Pensions, &c. 173
Dominion of Canada—Military Operations, 1060
Egypt—Military Expedition—Questions
Battle of Abu Klea, 839, 1055
Lord Wolseley's Report, 1064
Troops at Suakin, 834, 835 ;—Supplies for, 1276
Egypt—Soudan—Questions
Expedition to Suakin, 1267
Reported Death of Osman Digna, 1064
Suakin-Berber Railway, 54, 833
River Thames (No. 2), Lords Amendts. Consid. Amendt. 1858
Supply—Prisons, Ireland, 380

SMITH, Mr. S., *Liverpool*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 621; *cl.* 4, 733; Amendt. 754, 762, 763; *cl.* 5, 784; *add. cl.* 911; Consid. *add. cl.* 1390, 1420; *cl.* 3, 1469; *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1472, 1476; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1489, 1493
Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1117
Tramway Companies (Metropolis)—Employés' Hours of Labour, 1046

Smoke Nuisance Abatement (Metropolis) Bill [H.L.] (*The Lord Stratheden and Campbell*)
l. Read 2ª, after debate *July* 30, 476 (No. 50)

SOLICITOR GENERAL, The (*see* GORST, Sir J. E.)

Southwark and Vauxhall Water Bill [*Lords*] (*by Order*)
c. 2R. deferred *July* 27, 44
Order for 2R. discharged; Bill withdrawn, after short debate *July* 28, 238

SPEAKER, The (Right Hon. ARTHUR WELLESLEY PEEL), *Warwick*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1207, 1236, 1245, 1248
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. 579; Consid. *add. cl.* 1389, 1390, 1397, 1407, 1415, 1425, 1426, 1427, 1428; *cl.* 9, 1498, 1500; *cl.* 10, 1502, 1504, 1505
Depression of Trade and Industry, Royal Commission on—Constitution of the Commission, 1580
Earldom of Mar Restitution, 1R. 683; 2R. 684
Infants, Comm. 1856
Ireland—Law and Justice—Court of Queen's Bench (Fines and Penalties Office)—Mr. O'Brien, M.P. 823
Land Purchase (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* 1844
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Lords Amendts. Consid. 1558; *cl.* A, *ib.*
Parliament—Business of the House—Prorogation, Ministerial Statement, 1744
  New Rules of Procedure (Rule 2)—Adjournment of the House—Royal Commission on the Depression of Trade and Industry, &c. 1745
Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24, Res. 266, 283, 304, 305
Peru and Chili—Peruvian Bondholders, 1448
Police Enfranchisement Extension, Comm. 1523
Prince Henry of Battenberg's Naturalization, Comm. 681
Ramsden Estate, 3R. 1036, 1198
Representation of the People Act, 1884—Police Enfranchisement, 1459
Southwark and Vauxhall Water, 2R. 240

STANHOPE, Earl
Copyhold Enfranchisement, 2R. Amendt. 488

STANHOPE, Right Hon. E. (Vice President of the Committee of Council on Education), *Lincolnshire, Mid*
Agricultural Holdings (England)—The Bethell Charity—Trustees of Newark and Mr. R. Robinson, 1268
Allotments Extension Act, 1882—Folkestone Charity Land, 1737, 1738
  Lady Isabella Dodd's Charity, Ellesborough, Bucks, 1045
Charity Commissioners' Schemes—Labourers' Allotments, 1740
Church of England—Vicar of St. Mark's, South Shields, 672
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1244
Education Department—Questions
  College of Aberystwith, 842
  Instruction of Deaf-Mute Children, 1053
  London Board Schools—Annual Cost per Scholar, 1037
  London School Board, 1729;—Expenditure, 1054
  South Shields National Schools, 1728
Endowed Schools—Alderman Dauntsey's Charity (West Lavington), 1574, 1575
  Charity Commissioners—Tonbridge School, 1042, 1280, 1281
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Annual Financial Statement, Comm. 1354, 1355
Parliamentary Elections—Use of National Elementary School Rooms, 1044
Science and Art—Examinations in Drawing—Failures to Pass, 678

STANLEY, Right Hon. Colonel F. A. (Secretary of State for the Colonies), *Lancashire, N.*
Administration of Oaths (Canada), 1728
Africa (South)—Basutoland, 56, 57
Army Estimates—Provisions, Forage, &c, 81
Cyprus (Finance, &c.)—Landing Duties, 63
Federal Council of Australasia, Comm. *cl.* 15, 1122; *cl.* 18, 1123; *cl.* 29, Amendt. 1124
Supply—Prisons, Ireland, 378, 379
  Report, Res. 2, 543, 544
  South Africa and St. Helena, 455
Trade and Commerce—United States and the British West Indies, 250
Western Pacific—New Guinea—Form of Government for the English Portion, 1046

STANLEY, Hon. E. L., *Oldham*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1249
County Officers and Courts (Ireland) (Pensions), Comm. *add. cl.* 1517
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 617, 620; *cl.* 3, 625, 629, 699; *cl.* 4, 744; *cl.* 5, 778; *cl.* 6, 792; *cl.* 12, 795; *add. cl.* 908; Consid. *add. cl.* 1403; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1483; *cl.* 9, 1501
Housing of the Working Classes (England), 2R. Amendt. 1592
Police Enfranchisement Extension, Comm. 1523, 1524
Supply—South Africa and St. Helena, 467

Stansfeld, Right Hon. J., *Halifax*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 601; *cl.* 3, 710, 712; Amendt. 713; *cl.* 4, 742; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 784; *add. cl.* 862, 876, 879, 881, 883; Consid. *add. cl.* 1387, 1395; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1466, 1467; *cl.* 5, 1481, 1484; *cl.* 9, 1492; Amendt. 1493

Stationery Office, H.M.—Contracts for Government Printing
Question, Mr. Rylands; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *July* 28, 249; Question, Mr. Broadhurst; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *July* 31, 676

Stevenson, Mr. J. C., *South Shields*
Public Works (Loans), Comm. *add. cl.* 981

Storey, Mr. S., *Sunderland*
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 5, 1482; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1495, 1500
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 3, 1809; *cl.* 13, 1827; *cl.* 14, 1831, 1832

Stratheden and Campbell, Lord
Public Offices Site Act, 1882, 1716
Smoke Nuisance Abatement, 2R. 476, 481

Stuart, Mr. H. Villiers-, *Waterford Co.*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1216
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 5, 1483
Egypt—Internal Administration—Use of the Kourbash and Forced Labour, 840
International Guaranteed Loan, 524, 525; —Correspondence, 847
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 2, 985; *cl.* 14, Amendt. 1006, 1007; Lords Amendts. Consid. 1891
Land Purchase (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 2, 1653

Stuart, Mr. J., *Hackney*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 615; *cl.* 3, 707; *cl.* 4, 748; *cl.* 5, 771; Amendt. 775, 780, 781, 782, 783; *cl.* 6, 791; *cl.* 12, 807; *add. cl.* Amendt. 851, 858, 861, 871, 872, 874, 904; Consid. *cl.* 3, 1468; *cl.* 4, 1478; *cl.* 5, 1481, 1482; Amendt. 1485
Egypt—Military Expedition—Troops at Suakin, 834
Ireland—Board of Intermediate Education—Examination of Girls, 520
Parliament—Business of the House, 847, 1584, 1585

Submarine Telegraph Cables Bill
(*The Lord Sudeley*)
l. Read 3ª * *July* 27 (No. 203)
Royal Assent *Aug* 6 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 49]

Suez Canal, The—The Paris Conference
Question, Mr. Monk; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *Aug* 7, 1460

Sullivan, Mr. T. D., *Westmeath*
Ireland—Post Office—New Post Office at Mullingar, 1871
Royal Irish Constabulary—Appointment of Medical Officers, 57
Land Purchase (Ireland), Consid. *add. cl.* 1848
Parliament—Privilege—Speech of Mr. Bright, July 24, Res. 288, 302
Supply—Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, 447

Sunderland Corporation Bill (by Order)
c. Lords Amendts. considered; amended, and agreed to *Aug* 4, 1033

SUPPLY
Considered in Committee *July* 27, 67—Army Estimates, Votes 10 to 25; Civil Service Estimates—Class III.—Law and Justice, Vote 16; Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art, Votes 3, 12, 13; Class VII.—Miscellaneous, Votes 1, 2; Afghan War £250,000, Grant in Aid; Revenue Departments, Votes 1 to 5; Civil Service Supplementary Estimates—Class I.—Public Works and Buildings, Votes 2, 15a, 18, 24; Class III.—Law and Justice, Votes 7, 19; Class V.—Foreign and Colonial Services, Vote 5; Class VII.—Miscellaneous, Votes 3, 4, 5
Resolutions reported *July* 28, 380
Res. 1 to 29, inclusive, agreed to
(30.) £16,000 (Supplementary) (in Aid of the Cost of Maintenance of Disturnpiked and Main Roads in England and Wales); after short debate, Res. agreed to
Remaining Resolutions agreed to
Considered in Committee *July* 28, 306—Civil Service Estimates—Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art, Vote 18; Class III.—Law and Justice, Vote 30
Resolutions reported *July* 29
Considered in Committee *July* 29, 385—Civil Service Estimates—Class IV.—Education, Science, and Art, Vote 14; Class V.—Foreign and Colonial Services, Vote 6; Revenue Departments, Vote 3; Civil Service Estimates—Class I.—Public Works and Buildings, £500 (Supplementary) Gordon Monument
Resolutions reported *July* 30
Res. 1 (£466,303, Salaries and Expenses of the Commissioners of National Education in Ireland), 527; after short debate, Res. agreed to
Res. 2 (£24,690, South Africa and St Helena), 531; after short debate, Res. agreed to
Res. 3 (£4,254,659, Post Office), 545; after short debate, Res. agreed to
Res. 4 (£500, Supplementary, Gordon Monument), 548; after short debate, Res. agreed to

Sutherland, Mr. T., *Greenock*
Ceylon—Lighthouses—The Basses Lights—Minicoy Lighthouse, 1565
Egypt—Light Dues, 1566, 1567

SYNAN, Mr. E. J., *Limerick Co.*
Supply—Commissioners of National Education in Ireland, 409
Queen's Colleges in Ireland, 322

TALBOT, Mr. J. G., *Oxford University*
Consolidated Fund (Appropriation), 3R. 1249
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *add. cl.* 1395 ; Amendt. 1405
Edinburgh Extension and Sewerage, Consid. 43
Education Department—London School Board Expenditure, 1054
Mercantile Marine—Pilots—Test of Colour-Blindness, 1572

Telegraph Acts Amendment Bill
(*Mr. Shaw Lefevre, Mr. Hibbert*)
c. Committee; Report *July* 30, 554 [Bill 121]
Questions, Mr. Alderman W. Lawrence, Mr. Puleston ; Answers, Mr. Shaw Lefevre, The Postmaster General (Lord John Manners) *July* 31, 679
Order for 3R. read, and discharged *July* 31, 809
Moved, "That the Bill be re-committed in respect of Clause 2" (*Mr. Shaw Lefevre*) ; after short debate, Motion agreed to; Committee ; Report ; Considered ; read 3°
l. Read 1ª* (*L. Mount-Temple*) *Aug* 3 (No. 230)
Read 2ª, after short debate *Aug* 4, 1026
Committee* ; Report *Aug* 5
Read 3ª* *Aug* 6

TENNANT, Sir C., *Peeblesshire*
Trade and Commerce—United States and the British West Indies, 250

THOMASSON, Mr. J. P., *Bolton*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 715 ; Consid. *cl.* 4, Amendt. 1479
Educational Endowments (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 15, 1905
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. 1759
Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1110

THOMPSON, Mr. T. C., *Durham*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 614

THURLOW, Lord
Medical Relief Disqualification Removal, 36

TOMLINSON, Mr. W. E. M., *Preston*
Civil Service—Lower Division Clerks and Writers, 1734
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 601 ; *cl.* 6, Amendt. 785 ; *add. cl.* 906, 907 ; Consid. *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1462 ; *cl.* 4, 1478 ; *cl.* 5, 1482 ; *cl.* 9, 1495
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 1, 1768 ; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1769, 1800, 1803, 1815
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Disorderly Houses—Case of Mrs. Jeffries, 1871
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), Comm. *add. cl.* 205

TOMLINSON, Mr. W. E. M.—*cont.*
Patent Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 210
Prevention of Crimes Amendment, Comm. 210
Supply—Post Office Telegraphs, 183
Temporary Commissions and Committees, &c. 178
Valuation (Metropolis) Act, 1869—Appeals against Assessments, 1870

TORRENS, Mr. W. T. M'C., *Finsbury*
Housing of the Working Classes (England), 2R. 1620

TOTTENHAM, Mr. A. L., *Leitrim*
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. *cl.* 4, 988, 992 ; *add. cl.* 1024 ; Lords Amendts. Consid. 1892, 1893
Treaty of Berlin—Article X—The Varna-Rustchuk Railway Company, 1449

Trade and Commerce—The United States and the British West Indies
Question, Sir Charles Tennant ; Answer, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Colonel Stanley) *July* 28, 250

Trade and Navigation Accounts—Importation of Cattle, &c. from Ireland
Questions, Mr. Duckham, Mr. Newdegate ; Answers, The Secretary to the Board of Trade (Baron Henry De Worms) *Aug* 4, 1050

Tramways Order in Council (Ireland) Bill
c. Question, Colonel Colthurst ; Answer, Mr. Biggar *July* 30, 519
Bill withdrawn* *Aug* 7 [Bill 243]

TREASURY—First Lord (*see* IDDESLEIGH, Earl of)

TREASURY—Lord of (*see* DALRYMPLE, Mr. C.)

TREASURY — Financial Secretary (*see* HOLLAND, Sir H. T.)

TREASURY—Secretary to (*see* DOUGLAS, Mr. A. AKERS-)

Treaty of Berlin
Article X.—The Varna-Rustchuk Railway, Question, Observations, Lord Sandhurst ; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury *Aug* 7, 1434 ; Question, Mr. Tottenham ; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke), 1449
Article LXI.—Reforms in Armenia, Questions, Mr. M'Coan, Mr. Bryce ; Answers, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *Aug* 3, 835

TRURO, Lord
Waterworks Clauses Act (1847) Amendment, 3R. 25

[*cont.*

Trustees Relief Bill
(*Mr. Ince, Mr. Whitley*)
c. Bill withdrawn * *July* 27 [Bill 83]

Turbary (Ireland) Bill (*Mr. Lea, Mr. Thomas Dickson, Mr. Findlater*)
c. Bill withdrawn * *Aug* 7 [Bill 146]

Turkey (European Provinces)—Affairs of Macedonia—Report of Major Trotter
Question, Mr. Bryce; Answer, The Under Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs (Mr. Bourke) *July* 27, 62

Turnpike Acts Continuance Bill
(*Earl Brownlow*)
l. Read 3ª * *July* 27 (No. 174)
Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 37]

TYLER, Sir H. W., *Harwich*
Army—Railways in Time of War, 1456
Royal Military Academy, Woolwich—Meal Hours of Cadets, 332
Egypt—Soudan—Expedition to Suakin, 1267
Suakin-Berber Railway, 54, 833
Peru and Chili—Peruvian Bondholders, 1447, 1448
Railways (India)—Candahar and Quetta Railway, 523

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland
Question, Observations, The Earl of Milltown; Reply, The Marquess of Salisbury *Aug* 10, 1528

Universities (Scotland) Bill
(*The Lord Advocate, Secretary Sir William Harcourt, Mr. Solicitor General for Scotland*)
c. 2R. deferred, after short debate *July* 30, 630
Order for 2R. discharged; Bill withdrawn *Aug* 5, 1250 [Bill 115]

Valuation (Metropolis) Act, 1869—*Appeals against Assessments*
Questions, Mr. Tomlinson; Answers, The President of the Local Government Board (Mr. A. J. Balfour) *Aug* 12, 1870

VENTRY, Lord
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. 1265; Comm. *cl.* 18, Amendt. 1442; *cl.* 19, Amendt. *ib.*; *add. cl.* 1443, 1444, 1445; Report, *cl.* 19, Amendt. 1549

VERNEY, Right Hon. Sir H., *Buckingham*
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. *cl.* 1, 1766
India—East India Revenue Accounts—Annual Financial Statement, Comm. 1369

WALKER, Mr. S., *Londonderry Co.*
Land Purchase (Ireland), 2R. 1072; Comm. *cl.* 2, 1646; *cl.* 4, 1669; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1672, 1675; *cl.* 9, Amendt. 1684; *cl.* 17, Amendt. 1693; *add. cl.* 1699, 1700
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Lords Amendts. Consid. *cl.* B, 1559

WAR DEPARTMENT—Secretary of State (*see* SMITH, Right Hon. W. H.)

WAR DEPARTMENT—Under Secretary of State (*see* BURY, Viscount)

WAR DEPARTMENT —Financial Secretary (*see* NORTHCOTE, Hon. H. S.)

WARTON, Mr. C. N., *Bridport*
Agricultural Holdings (England)—Bethell Charity Trustees of Newark and Mr. R. Robinson, 1268
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. 586; *cl.* 2, 598, 601; Amendt. 602; *cl.* 3, 693, 695; *cl.* 4, 743, 751, 766; *cl.* 5, 781, 784; *add. cl.* 858, 859; Amendt. 861, 879, 910, 911; Schedule, Amendt. 920, 921; Consid. *add. cl.* Amendt. 1386, 1387, 1388, 1396, 1397, 1404, 1428; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1461, 1462, 1463; *cl.* 3, Amendt. 1467, 1469; *cl.* 4, 1479
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. 1749; *cl.* 3, 1799
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Circuit Arrangements, 817
Lunacy Acts Amendment, Comm. 382
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), Comm. *add. cl.* 197, 202, 204, 205, 206, 207
Ramsden Estate, 3R. 1036
Supply, Report, Res. 3, 546

WATERFORD, Marquess of
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), 2R. 1264; Comm. 1436, 1440; *cl.* 12, Amendt. 1441; *cl.* 13, Amendt. *ib.*; *cl.* 16, *ib.*; Amendt. 1442; *cl.* 18, *ib.*; *add. cl.* Amendt. 1443, 1444, 1445; Report, 1547; *cl.* 16, Amendt. 1548; *add. cl.* 1549
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Report, *add. cl.* 1431; Commons Reasons Consid. 1707
Poor Law Unions' Officers (Ireland), 2R. 494; 3R. 1260

WATERLOW, Sir S. H., *Gravesend*
Housing of the Working Classes (England), Comm. 1755; *cl.* 3, 1783; Amendt. 1798; *cl.* 13, 1827, 1829; *cl.* 14, 1834

Waterworks Clauses Act (1847) Amendment Bill (*Viscount Enfield*)
l. Read 3ª, after debate *July* 27, 24 (No. 127)
Royal Assent *July* 31 [48 & 49 *Vict.* c. 34]

WATKIN, Sir E. W., *Hythe*
Allotments Extension Act, 1882—Folkestone Charity Land, 1738

WAVENEY, Lord
Defences of the Empire—Armaments and Munitions of War, 24

[*cont.*

WAVENEY, Lord—*cont.*
Local Government (Ireland) Provisional Orders, Commons Reasons Consid. 1711, 1714
Scottish and Irish Peerages, Bill withdrawn, 812

WAYS AND MEANS
Inland Revenue
Grocers' Licences (Ireland), Question, Colonel Nolan; Answer, The Chancellor of the Exchequer *Aug* 3, 836
Stamps—Stamp Distributors in Dublin, Question, Mr. Gray; Answer, The Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Henry Holland) *July* 30, 510

WAYS AND MEANS
Considered in Committee *July* 29
Resolved, That, towards making good the Supply granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year ending on the 31st day of March 1886, the sum of £45,361,227 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom
Resolution reported *July* 30
[See title *Consolidated Fund (Appropriation) Bill*]

WEBSTER, Sir R. E. (Attorney General), *Launceston*
Corrupt Practices Act — Suffolk Conservative Association, 1047
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 2, 594, 597, 598, 601, 602, 604, 612, 614, 615, 617, 620, 621, 622; *cl.* 3, 623, 624, 625, 692, 694, 699, 711, 712, 713, 714; *cl.* 4, 765; *cl.* 5, 767, 776, 784; *cl.* 6, 785; Amendt. 788, 789; *cl.* 10, 794; *cl.* 12, *ib.* 795, 796; *add. cl.* 858, 859, 864, 866; Amendt. 870, 871, 877, 835, 897, 905, 906, 909, 918; Consid. *add. cl.* 1387, 1389, 1399, 1405, 1407, 1410
Defences of the Empire—Defence of the Seaports, 60
Earldom of Mar Restitution, 2R. 684; Comm. 685
High Court of Justice—Report of Committee of Inquiry, 1062
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Circuit Arrangements, 817
Marriage Law—Attendance of Registrars, 1039
Parliamentary Elections—Eye Election, 527
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), Comm. *add. cl.* 199, 203, 205, 207

WEBSTER, Mr. J., *Aberdeen*
Edinburgh Extension and Sewerage, Consid. Amendt. 37, 44
Parliament—Business of the House, 242
Universities (Scotland), 2R. 630

WEMYSS, Earl of
Army—Field Artillery and Small Arms, 1525
Defences of the Empire — Armaments and Munitions of War, 19
Egypt (Soudan)—The Friendly Tribes, 1031
Labourers (Ireland) (No. 2), Comm. 1440; Report, 1546, 1547

[cont.

WEMYSS, Earl of—*cont.*
Law and Police—The International Club, 236, 237
Recent Legislation — Socialistic Tendency, 632, 648, 654
River Thames (No. 2), Report, *cl.* 6, 814; 3R. 1525

Western Pacific—New Guinea—Form of Government for the English Portion
Questions, Viscount Lymington, Mr. Bryce; Answers, The Secretary of State for the Colonies (Colonel Stanley) *Aug* 4, 1046
[See title *New Guinea*]

WEST, Mr. H. W., *Ipswich*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 3, 691; *add. cl.* 871
Parliament—Business of the House, 1064

WHITBREAD, Mr. S., *Bedford*
Army Estimates — Miscellaneous Effective Services, 163, 164
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 6, 792; *add. cl.* Amendt. 863, 865; Consid. *cl.* 4, 1471, 1476

WHITLEY, Mr. E., *Liverpool*
Law and Justice (England and Wales)—Circuit System, 673
Parliamentary Elections (Returning Officers), Comm. *add. cl.* 202, 205
Supply—Post Office Packet Service, 181, 182
Temporary Commissions and Committees, &c. Amendt. 177, 178

WILLIAMSON, Mr. S., *St. Andrews, &c.*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. Schedule, 921
Peru and Chili—Peruvian Bondholders, 1056, 1057, 1446, 1447, 1448
Sea Fisheries (Scotland) Amendment, 2R. 209; Comm. 983; *cl.* 2, Amendt. 1173, 1174; *cl.* 4, Amendt. *ib.*, 1177, 1181; *cl.* 5, Amendt. 1182, 1183; *cl.* 6, 1185; *cl.* 7, 1190; *cl.* 10, Amendt. *ib.*; *add. cl.* 1191
Secretary for Scotland, Comm. *cl.* 5, 1148

WILLIS, Mr. W., *Colchester*
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 4, 1478

WILMOT, Sir J. E., *Warwickshire, S.*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 4, 745; Consid. *cl.* 3. Amendt. 1466

WINCHESTER, Bishop of
Criminal Law Amendment, Commons Amendts. Consid. 1556

WODEHOUSE, Mr. E. R., *Bath*
Supply, Report, Res. 2, 532

WOLFF, Right Hon. Sir H. D., *Portsmouth*
Navy—Dockyard Expenditure, 516

Women's Suffrage Bill [H.L.]
(*The Lord Denman*)
l. Moved, "That the Bill be now read 2ª" *July* 28, 216; after short debate, a Question being stated thereupon, the Question was put Whether the said Question shall be now put; resolved in the negative (No. 27)

Woodall, Mr. W., *Stoke-on-Trent*
Criminal Law Amendment, Consid. *cl.* 4, 1478
Education Department—Instruction of Deaf-Mute Children, 1053
Educational Endowments (Ireland), Comm. *cl.* 15, 1904
Registration of Voters—Return of Occupiers—England and Wales, 1051

Worcester Extension Bill (*by Order*)
c. Lords Amendts. considered, and agreed to *July* 31, 660

Works—First Commissioner (*see* Plunket, Right Hon. D. R.)

Wortley, Mr. C. B. Stuart- (Under Secretary of State for the Home Department), *Sheffield*
Criminal Law Amendment, Comm. *cl.* 8, Amendt. 793; *add. cl.* 889; Consid. *cl.* 5, 1483; *cl.* 9, 1489
Prevention of Crimes Amendment, Comm. 211; *cl.* 1, 1857
Prince Henry of Battenberg's Naturalization, 2R. 681; Comm. *ib.*
Registration of Voters—Return of Occupiers—England and Wales, 1051

END OF VOLUME CCC., AND EIGHTH VOLUME OF SESSION 1884-5.

BIBL.
LONDIN.
UNIV.

LONDON: CORNELIUS BUCK, 22, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.